LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA

UNIVERSITY of
PENNSYLVANIA
LIBRARIES

V.11,

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW:

EDITED FOR

The Alumni Association

OF

FRANKLIN AND MARSHALL COLLEGE;

BY

REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D. AND REV. P. SCHAFF, D. D.

Neque enim quæro intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.—*Anselm.*

VOLUME XI.---1859.

PUBLISHED FOR THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION
BY GEORGE B. RUSSELL, PITTSBURG, PA.

CHAMBERSBURG:
M. KIEFFER & CO.
1859.

STORAGE
205
R255
v. 11, 1859

UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS OF VOL. XI.

ARTICLE. PAGE.

NO. I.

I. The Synod at Frederick, Md., ... 1
By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

II. The Heidelberg Catechism—Its Formation and First Introduction in the Palatinate, . . 47
By the Rev. Henry Harbaugh, Lancaster, Pa.

III. The Human Body and Disease, considered from the Christian Stand-point, ... 63
By Lewis H. Steiner, M. D., Baltimore, Md.

IV. Introduction to the Study of Philosophy, . 93
By J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.

V. The Office of Bishop, ... 107
By the Rev. Daniel Gans, Harrisburg, Pa.

VI. The Palatinate—A Historico-Geographical Sketch, 140
By Prof. Adolph L. Kœppen, Lancaster, Pa.

VII. Recent Publications, ... 147

NO. II.

I. Sketches of a Traveller from Greece, Constantinople, Asia Minor and Palestine, . . . 149
By Prof. Adolph L. Kœppen, Lancaster, Pa.

II. Natural and Supernatural, . . . 176
By John W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

III. The Religious Character of Washington, . 211
By the Rev. Amos H. Kremer, Carlisle, Pa.

IV. A Discourse by Dr. Rauch: Every Man is the Lord's. 222
Edited by E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.

V. The Athanasian Creed, ... 232
By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.

VI. The Palatinate: A Historico-Geographical Sketch, (Second Article,) Its history from the earliest times to the extinction of the elder Electoral line in 1559, ... 271
By Prof. Adolph L. Kœppen, Lancaster, Pa.

VII. Calvin's Order of Baptism, . . . 298
Translated from the Latin of the Genevan Catechism, by Prof. Thomas C. Porter, Lancaster, Pa.

VIII. Anglo-Latin Hymns, ... 304
By James W. Alexander, D. D., New York.
IX. Recent Publications. 307

NO. III.

I. The Wonderful Nature of Man, . . . 317
By John W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.
II. The Apostolic Commission, ... 337
By the Rev. D. Y. Heisler, Bethlehem, Pa.
III. Alexander on Mark, ... 361
By the Rev. Edward D. Yeomans, Trenton, N. J.
IV. The Power Behind the Throne, . . 368
By the Rev. Henry Harbaugh, Lancaster, Pa.
V. What is Poetry? 382
By Prof. Theodore Appel, Lancaster, Pa.
VI. On Extempore Preaching, ... 398
By the Rev. Edwin Emerson, Greencastle, Pa.
VII. Anglo-German Hymns, ... 414
By James W. Alexander, D. D., New York.
VIII. The Crystal Palace at Sydenham, . . 527
By Philip Schaff, D. D., Mercersburg, Pa.
IX. Eulogy on the Rev. Dr. Rauch, . . . 442
By John W. Nevin, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.
X. Recent Publications, . , . . . 467

NO. IV.

I. Religion and Christianity, ... 483
By E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.
II. Christian Union and the Liturgical Tendencies of the Times, ... 506
By A Layman.
III. Anglo-German Life in America, . . . 536
By the Rev. George B. Russell, Pittsburg, Pa.
IV. Faith and Knowledge, ... 557
By the Rev. Henry Harbaugh, Lancaster, Pa.
V. The Idyls of Theocritus, ... 570
By Prof. William M. Nevin, Lancaster, Pa.
VI. The Eutychian Churches, ... 585
By Prof. J. A. Reubelt, Trenton, Tennssee
VII. Every Man is the Lord's in Death: A Discourse By Dr. Rauch, ... 609
Edited by E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Lancaster, Pa.
VIII. Recent Publications, ... 622

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JANUARY, 1859.

Art. I.—THE SYNOD AT FREDERICK.

The first Christian Synod was held A. D. 50, twenty years after the resurrection of the Lord and the founding of the Church, in the city of Jerusalem, for the purpose of settling an important doctrinal and disciplinary controversy concerning the relation of the Mosaic law to the Gentile converts, or the principle whether faith in Christ alone, or faith *and* circumcision, *i. e.*, the observance of the ceremonial law, were necessary to salvation. The Synod was no secret caucus, but an open deliberative assembly; no exclusive hierarchical body, but republican in the best sense of the term. It included, besides the apostles, also the elders and brethren who are expressly mentioned by the inspired historian, even at the final decision.* There was "much disputing," πολλη συνζητησις, on that occasion: party stood against party, congregation against congregation, the Gentile converts against the Jewish believers, and even the apostles, though not identified with the extreme factions, were at first at issue on the points of controversy, as we must infer from the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. But they were animated by the spirit of their Master; they were equally zealous for the spread of his kingdom and the unity among believers; the Holy Ghost moved upon the face of the agitated waves; the very dispute and free discussion elicited truth, exposed error,

* Acts xv. 6, 7, 12, 13, 23.

strengthened conviction, urged on to a settlement of the difficulty, and the meeting ended in harmony and peace, by the unanimous adoption of a compromise, which satisfied the just claims of both parties, without sacrificing the great principle of the saving power of a living faith in Christ Jesus our Lord.

The synodical form of government, though not expressly enjoined by divine command, is, therefore, evidently sanctioned by apostolic practice. In the course of time, Synods or Councils were regularly convened either annually or semi-annually in the various provinces, and became the highest organs of legislation in the ancient Church, for the settlement of doctrinal, ritual and disciplinary controversies. We meet them first under this character in Asia Minor, Greece, and in North Africa, about the middle of the second century, in the disputes concerning the Montanistic movement and the time and manner of observing Easter. The meetings were public, and the people of the surrounding community made their influence felt. In the time of Cyprian, as we learn from his own epistles, presbyters, confessors and prominent laymen took an active part besides the presiding bishops. At the Synod of Carthage A. D. 256, which decided against the validity of heretical baptism, there were present eighty-seven bishops, a large number of priests and deacons, and "*maxima pars plebis*," as Cyprian reports. In the Synods concerning the restoration of those who had denied Christ during the persecution from fear of death, Cyprian convened, besides the bishops, his clergy, the confessors, and "laicos stantes," i. e., laymen in good and regular standing. Nor was this practice confined to North Africa. It prevailed in Syria, at the Synods assembled for the trial and deposition of the unworthy bishop, Paul at Samosata, A. D. 264-269, and in Spain, at the Council of Elvira A. D. 305. The famous Origen of Alexandria, though merely a presbyter, was the leading spirit of two Arabian Synods and there convinced bishop Beryllus of Bostra of his christological error. Even the Roman clergy, in their letter to Cyprian about the mid-

dle of the third century, speak of a common synodical consultation of the bishops with the priests, deacons, confessors, and laymen in good standing. Athanasius, though at that time only an archdeacon of the bishop of Alexandria, took a prominent part in the first œcumenical Council at Nice, A. D. 325, and the refutation of the Arian heresy. Professor Hefele of Tübingen, a Roman Catholic divine and disciple of the illustrious Möhler, in his learned history of Councils, admits these facts, but maintains that the bishops only had a vote in the ecclesiastical assemblies. But in several councils of the ante-Nicene age, the presbyters and deacons subscribed their names to the acts and conclusions after those of the bishops, as may be seen from the first volume of Harduin's Collections. This subscription has no proper sense except on the ground of their recognition as regular members of the body.

It is true, however, that this republican and popular element gradually disappeared with the development of the hierachical principle. After the Council of Nice in 325, bishops alone had seat and voice, and the priests appear merely as secretaries, or advisers, or representatives of their bishops. The bishops, moreover, did not act as the representatives of their churches, nor in the name of the body of the believers, as in the first three centuries, but in their own divine right as the successors of the apostles, and as constituting exclusively the *ecclesia docens.* This hierarchical feature characterizes all the Councils of the middle ages, and the Councils of the Greek and Roman Church to this day. The papal system, as all systems of centralized government, is constitutionally and instinctively averse to deliberative assemblies and freedom of discussion, and tolerates Synods only as advisory or executive bodies for the purpose of giving solemn sanction to decrees emanating from the seat of power. Hence the popes did all they could, first to prevent, and afterwards to break up the reformatory Councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basel, in the fifteenth century; and every body knows how long they resisted, in spite of their repeated promises, the urgent de-

mands, and how often they disappointed the expectations, of a general Council for the settlement of the great Protestant controversy of the sixteenth century. Since the Council of Trent, which was brought to a close in 1564, twenty years after its first session, the Roman Church has held no general Synod, except in 1854, and this was merely a convention of bishops summoned by the present pope for the sole purpose, not of discussing, but of approving and proclaiming the papal decree concerning the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin as a binding article of the Roman Catholic faith.

It is the general merit of the Protestant Reformation, in opposition to the exclusive hierarchical principle of Romanism, which identifies the Church with a special priesthood, culminating in the pope, to have brought out the principle of the general priesthood of believers, and to have proclaimed the right of the Christian people in the government and discipline of the Church, by a regular orderly representation. It is the particular merit of the Reformed Church, as distinct from the Lutheran, to have carried this principle into practice, by reviving, in a modified form, the primitive office of elders and deacons, and by establishing a local congregational and general synodical government on a popular, we might say, republican basis. If the Roman Church has been called the Church of priests, and the Lutheran Church, the Church of theologians, the Reformed Church must be called the Church of the people, or of the congregation. But the Reformed confession asserts the rights of the people, not in a disorderly and pseudo-democratic sense, which would lead to mobocracy and anarchy; but by way of a legitimate representation and in connection with a strict discipline which makes the eligibility to church offices and the right of voting dependent upon the good and regular standing of the members. It is only on the basis of such Christian discipline that the Reformed principle can thrive and succeed. Hence the great stress laid upon this point already by Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, Bullinger, and more fully by Farel, Calvin, Beza, John de Lasky and Knox.

The first Protestant Synod was held in February, 1528, at Berne in Switzerland, the mother-land of the Reformed communion.* In several cantons regular annual or semi-

---

* The high Church Episcopal "*Church Journal*" of New York for Nov. 3, sees fit to ridicule Reformed Synods without bishops. In noticing the article of the Rev. H. Harbaugh on Synods, in the last number of the Mercersburg Review, it says:

"The Mercersburg *Review* opens with an article on Reformed Synods, which is to us dreary in the extreme. The history of the rise and varieties of Presbyterian Synods, at Berne, in Geneva, in France, in various parts of Germany and the Low countries, in Scotland and England and America, among the "Reformed" and the "Lutherans,"—all this is wearisome to mind and heart. Which comes nearest to the pure "Presbyterian ideal," is a matter of comparative indifference to us. The question is settled *for us* on the first page. "The first Synod in the Reformed sense," it tells us, "was beyond doubt the one held at Berne, February 13, 1528." That will do for the first "Synod" held *without Bishops*. It is also "beyond doubt" that the first Synod *with Bishops*—and also with "elders and brethren"—was held in Jerusalem, in the year of Grace 52: and such Synods continue to be held, to this day. A careful reader of the article, however, will find many incidental proofs of the vast superiority of the Church system, and can reckon up the heavy toll paid to the truth, by the flounderings and tanglings and perpetual changings of error. . . . . It is not among such specimens of ecclesiastical *felo de se* (i. e., Reformed Churches without Protestant Episcopal Diocesans], such acephalous organizations, that we are to look for the Church of the Future in America!"

We have no controversy with the Episcopal Church, which we sincerely esteem and love for its standards, its ministers and membership, its important mission and salutary, conservative influence among the various Christian denominations of this country. But to the writer of the above specimen of modest and charitable criticism, we feel strongly tempted, in reply, to address the following questions:

1. Who were the Protestant Episcopal Diocesans in the apostolic Council at Jerusalem, A. D. 52 (or rather 50)?

2. Where are the inspired apostles, evangelists and prophets in the Diocesan and Triennial General Conventions of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America?

3. What has become of the Convocations of the Church of England since 1717?

4. How many wives had Henry VIII, the first "supreme *head*" of the Episcopal Church of England, and what did he do with them?

5. How many beaux had Elizabeth, the first "supreme *governor*" of the Church of England?

6. How often did Cramner, the first archbishop of the Protestant Church of England, abjure his faith?

7. How much was the Reformation of England and its earliest standard divines indebted to Luther, Melanchthon, Zwingli, Calvin, Bullinger, Bucer, Fagius, Peter Martyr, and other Lutheran, German, and Swiss Reformers?

8. Who helped to frame the Thirty Nine Articles and the Common Prayer

annual Synods were instituted, with or without lay delegation, yet always under the general control of the civil government, as may be expected from the union of Church and State, which there prevails as well as in Germany. But there has never been a *general* Synod of the Reformed Churches of Switzerland, each canton having its own independent ecclesiastical organization. This is certainly a defect. The evangelical portion of the Swiss ministers have indeed held for several years past an annual Conference for the discussion of important theological and practical questions. But this Pastoral Conference is altogether free and has no official character nor legislative authority. I was highly delighted by the interesting discussions and fraternal intermingling of such a meeting at Basel in 1854, but greatly surprised, at the same time, that so few of the members seemed to have any desire for a general consolidation of the Swiss Churches in one organic body, and that even the worthy President, Dr. Hagenbach, the Church historian, discouraged any tendency in this direction. Since that time, however, the idea of a general legislative Synod has made some progress.*

In Germany pastoral conferences of a similar character have been held since the revival of evangelical religion, especially in Württemberg and in Prussia. The largest

---

Book in the age of Edward and Elizabeth, according to the testimony of your own Burnet?

9. What has become of Newman, Manning, Wilberforce, and many others, who but a few years ago were lauded and commended by just such men as the editors of the "Church Journal," as the brightest ornaments and soundest divines of the same Church of England?

10. What special claims have the Onderdonks, Doanes and Ives, of this country, to be regarded as the successors of the holy apostles?

Until the "Church Journal" satisfactorily answers these questions, which might easily be multiplied, we take the liberty of giving its editors the advice: Sweep before your own door; mind the eleventh commandment; be humble, and learn as your fathers did, for nothing befits you so well.

*We just learn from Hagenbach's *Kirchenblatt fuer die Reformirte Schweiz*, for Sept. 2, 1858, that the principle topic of discussion at the last Pastoral Conference held at Aarau, in August, 1858, was the "closer union of the Swiss Reformed Church. To what extent and in what respect is it desirable? What can the Pastoral Conference do towards its promotion?"

and most influential body of this kind is the German Evangelical Church Diet, which convenes annually since 1848, and consists of pious ministers and laymen of the Evangelical, Lutheran and Reformed Churches. These free conferences have nothing to do with church government or other business matters; they are strictly spiritual and devotional in their character, and, therefore, very interesting, refreshing and edifying. But the very idea of a Synod in the Reformed, as well as in the old Catholic sense, includes legislative and judicial functions.

The Synodical system in Europe was most fully matured in the Reformed Churches of France, the Wupperthal, the lower Rhine, Holland and Scotland. It is impossible to calculate the amount of influence for good, which has proceeded from these assemblies, upon the pastors and people under their charge. If the Wupperthal in Prussia, if Holland, especially in former days, and if Scotland have been, and are still so highly distinguished by the general intelligence, ecclesiastical order and religious life among the people, it is to be attributed, in a great measure, to their presbyterian and synodical form of government.

Yet after all, the great principle of ecclesiastical self-government, and, therefore, the true idea of a Snyod, is not and cannot be fully realized in any of the Protestant Churches of Europe, as long as they are united with the secular power, and hold to the Erastian or Cæsaro-papal doctrine, that the head of the State is also the head of the Church within his dominion. It is characteristic, that a commissioner of the crown and a layman generally presides over these ecclesiastical meetings, even the assemblies of the Kirk of Scotland. Their decisions must be confirmed by government before they can pass into laws, and these governments, as matters now stand in Europe, are of such a mixed character as to religious profession, that a variety of interests, altogether foreign perhaps to those of any particular denomination, must be consulted in granting or refusing the necessary sanction.

In this respect the Churches of America are in advance

of their mother churches in Europe. Here the Church and the State are separated, although by no means hostile to each other as in the ante-Nicene age. Each power manages its own affairs independent of the other. The Church enjoys the protection of the State for its property and free exercise of its discipline and its worship; while the State is continually receiving the incalculable benefit of the moral power which emanates from the Church upon its own citizens. This peaceful separation has been brought about without design and calculation of men, by Providence itself in the irresistible course of events. The necessary result of it is, the voluntary principle in the support of religion and the self-government of the Church. The civil and political self-government, on which the constitution of the United States rests, is itself a result of the Reformation, and more particularly of the Reformed principle; while in turn, the privilege of religious freedom can now be fully enjoyed on the basis of, and in connection with, civil and political freedom.

In America then, we see the principle of ecclesiastical self-government fully established, but under different forms, in the different denominations. The constitution and polity of the Old School Presbyterian, the Dutch Reformed, and the German or Evangelical Reformed Churches are strictly presbyterian and synodical, each congregation having its local self-government in the consistory, i. e., the pastor with the elders and deacons; each district being united under the Presbytery or Classis; and the whole body being governed by the general Synod as the highest legislative and judicial tribunal. The Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States has, in addition to its episcopal supervision, its annual diocesan and its triennial General Conventions or Synods with lay representation and full legislative powers. The Methodist Episcopal Church differs from the other Protestant denominations by excluding the lay element from its Conferences. The Congregational or Independent Churches of New England have a full congregational self-government, but to the exclusion of a

higher tribunal, and allow only advisory power to their Associations and Consociations. The General Assembly of the New School Presbyterian Church, since 1840, and the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in the United States, organized in 1820, but embracing as yet only a portion of this denomination, are likewise deprived of legislative authority and function, which is ceded to the particular or district Synods. They thus occupy a middle ground between Presbyterianism and Congregationalism.

The German Reformed Church in this country was first organized as a Synod in the city of Philadelphia, A. D. 1747, one year before the Lutheran, and has since that time held one hundred and twelve regular annual meetings exclusive of special Synods. As is customary with all the leading ecclesiastical bodies of the country, an abstract or summary of the proceedings is printed every year for the use of the ministers and elders under its care.* But these Minutes of Synod are simply a dry skeleton, a *caput mortuum* of the actual life which animates these meetings. The names of delegates and advisory members, the various committees and their reports as far as adopted, the results and resolutions arrived at, are faithfully recorded; but the speeches, the debates and the entire process through which the Synod passes until it reaches those results, are left out. We are far from finding fault with this custom; full official reports of all the transactions and speeches, like the reports of all the sessions of our civil legislatures and of the Federal Congress, would form too large and expensive volumes for practical use and embrace a great deal that is merely of local or transient interest or not worth recording at all.

---

* Is it not time now for our Synod, or its officers, or some other member well acquainted with its history, to take into consideration the propriety of preparing a full and well arranged digest of all our Synodical Minutes, with running titles and full alphabetical indexes for convenient reference? Such an epitome might be brought within the compass of one or two moderate volumes and could be much easier prepared now, than twenty or fifty years hence, when the preparation of a work of the kind will be a practical necessity. The O. S. Presbyterian Church has recently been provided with such a digest, which is said to be of incalculable use to its members

Still it is desirable to have, besides these indispensable official Minutes, graphic life-pictures of the several Synods, presenting their inner history and progress from year to year. Such sketches might be furnished annually by the editors of our church papers or other members of the Synod, and would form important material for the future historian.

The "Princeton Review and Biblical Repertory" is in the habit of giving an annual review of the more important transactions of the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church. Without pledging ourselves to a similar task for the "Mercersburg Review," and without the least disposition to sit in critical judgment over the actions of our own Synod, we propose in this article merely to give our personal recollections and impressions of the last annual meeting, with such occasional remarks as the nature of the different subjects may suggest.

It has been our privilege to attend either as delegate, or more frequently as advisory member, thirteen annual meetings of our Synod in part or in full, that is, every one except two, since our arrival in this country in 1844. We have always enjoyed them heartily as feasts of Christian friendship and fraternal consultation on the sacred interests of the Church. We never returned home without being spiritually refreshed and encouraged to labor in its service. We always felt, that, indifference to these annual gatherings of brethren, betrays an aleniation of feeling from the Church itself and is inconsistent with our most solemn vows and duties as its ordained ministers. It is true, that, besides the strictly spiritual interests, there is always a considerable amount of mere business and technical formality, that claims the attention and takes up the time of such assemblies. But this is unavoidable in a country like this, where the Church has to manage her own affairs temporal and spiritual, and all that can be reasonably expected and desired is, that financial and other external business matters should be so managed and matured by the committees in their private sessions, that little else would be left for

Synod but to adopt the reports; while all the more important spiritual topics should be fully and freely discussed, for the benefit of the attending laity, as well as the ministry. We must admit that our Church is as yet considerably behind some of the leading denominations of the land as regards liberality and efficiency in carrying forward the benevolent enterprises of the day. But almost every Synod reports a progress in the right direction, and every step in advance is a stimulus to increased activity for the future. And as regards ability of discussion, and parliamentary tact and general interest of the topics brought under consideration, the German Reformed Synod, if we take into consideration its limited extent, its peculiar difficulties, and comparatively recent awakening to its proper work and mission, is, in our humble opinion, and as far as we are able to judge from our own observation, inferior to no ecclesiastical assembly in the land.

But the crowning feature of our Synod, which makes its sessions so delightful and refreshing, is the genial flow of soul and the spirit of brotherly love and kindness, or if we may say so that German *Gemüthlichkeit*, which has thus far uniformly animated and controlled its membership, English as well as German, in their public and private intercourse, even amidst and after the most exciting controversies and debates. Ministers and elders meet and part as Christian brethren and friends, and are always ready to forgive and forget any offences which weak and sinful human nature may have committed in the heat of excitement. The Synod has within the last ten or twenty years passed through the storms of what may be termed almost a theological revolution, and yet—thanks to an overruling Providence and the spirit of Christian charity and moderation —it is now more firmly and deeply united and consolidated than ever. Even those ministers, who, in consequence of these theological controversies and for motives best known to themselves, have been temporarily aleniated from the general movement of the Church, or have left it altogether, must in honesty confess, that they have been treat-

ed with marked liberality, kindness and indulgence, and that they would have been permitted at any time to resume their former position of influence and trust. This is especially exemplified in Synod's course towards the North Carolina Classis, which bids fair to end in a permanent reunion, only strengthened and deepened by a temporary aleniation.

The last meeting of the Synod, held at Frederick city, Md., between the nineteenth and twenty-eighth of October, 1858, was an important, interesting and delightful one. The English Reformed congregation of the beautiful city of Frederick, the second for wealth and commerce in the State of Maryland, is perhaps the largest and richest in the German Reformed Church and might take the lead in all its general movements and benevolent operations. It is also one of the oldest in the denomination, and probably the oldest in the place. For when the indefatigueable missionary, Rev. Michael Schlatter, from St. Gall, in Switzerland, visitted the town in 1748, he found there already a new church in the course of erection, and a large congregation.* It possesses, since 1849, a new, tasteful and very comfortable house of worship in the centre of the town and opposite the venerable old church, where the second congregation, com-

* In his Journal Schlatter gives the following interesting account of his services in that place, a hundred and ten years ago: "When I was preparing myself for the first prayer, and saw the tears of the spiritually hungry souls roll down over their cheeks, my heart was singularly moved and enkindled with love, so that I fell upon my knees, in which the whole congregation followed me, and with much love and holy desire, I commended the house and congregation to the Triune God, and wrestled for a blessing from the Lord upon them. After the sermon, I administered the Holy Supper to ninety-seven members, baptized several aged persons and children, and married three betrothed couple, and installed new elders and deacons—all of which was done with the greatest propriety of deportment, deep reverence, much enlivening of heart, and to general edification. It is a great advantage to this congregation that they have the best schoolmaster that I have met with in America" (Mr. Schley, the ancestor of the several families of that name, who is said to have built the first house in Frederick, which was still standing three or four years ago.) "He spares neither labor nor pains in instructing the young and edifying the congregation according to his ability, by means of singing and reading the word of God and printed sermons on every Lord's day."

See Mr. Harbaugh's Life and Labors of Rev. Michael Schlatter, &c., Phila. 1857, p. 176 and 177 Comp., also Dr. Zacharias' centenary discourse, preached at the consecration of the new German Reformed church in Frederick in 1849.

posed altogether of Germans, hold divine service. The Synod, which never met there since the last twenty-three or four years, was entertained with true Southern hospitality, and guests and hosts parted with the kindest feelfeelings of mutual gratitude and deep regret at the shortness of their social intercourse. The unusually and uninterruptedly fine weather, the clear skies, the balmy air, the mild sun of that most delightful American season, the Indian summer, when nature before its long winter sleep once more shines forth in all its smiling beauty, contributed not a little to the pleasure of the meeting. The sessions as well as the devotional services in the morning and evening were largely attended by an intelligent and attentive congregation, including many Lutherans, Presbyterians and Episcopalians. Able and impressive sermons were delivered in both languages every evening and on Sunday, on the ministry, on the happy lot of the Christian, on marriage, on the imitation of Christ and obedience to his call, on the kingdom of heaven, on the judgment day, on the atonement, on the holy communion, &c., besides several short and pointed missionary addresses at the anniversary of the Home Missionary Society. The pulpits of most of the other churches were likewise filled by members of Synod.

A new feature in this Synod was the setting apart of two afternoon sessions for free discussion on the important topics of pastoral visitation, catechetical instruction and family religion, which elicited a number of animated, interesting and edifying speeches and attracted a large audience of ladies and gentlemen from different denominations. It is to be hoped, that this precedent may be followed in future meetings of the Synod, especially during the early part of the session, before the regular business of the standing committees can be properly matured. We are sure, that such discussions on theological or practical subjects of general interest, will make the Synodical meetings more profitable both to the ministers and to the community where they are held.

The greater part of the time of the business sessions was occupied, as usual, with the discussion and adoption of the reports of the standing committees, on minutes of Synod, on minutes of Classis, on overtures, on correspondence with sister churches, on examination, licensure and ordination, on the state of religion and statistical reports, on the Theological Seminany, on foreign and domestic missions, on finances, on nominations and on publication. But besides these, several other topics of considerable importance came before Synod either in the form of appeals, or of reports of special committees. These topics were partly of a delicate and controversial nature and elicited a good deal of exciting discussion, which, it must be humbly admitted, was not altogether free from personalities. Even at the last session several resolutions were offered, which threatened to prolong the meeting and to throw it into agitation and confusion. But they were happily disposed of or postponed, and as the meeting drew to a close, the troubled seas became calm and serene, a feeling of solemnity filled the minds and hearts of members, and the Synod wound up at last in peace and harmony, in prayer and praise to the great Head of the Church militant on earth. Such a close always vividly reminds one of the innumerable assembly of the Church triumphant in heaven, when all the questions of time will be settled in the light of eternity, when war and strife will be swallowed up in victory and peace, and when separation will give place to never-ending union around the throne of glory.

We now propose to take up some of the more important topics, which claimed the attention of last Synod, for short notice as far as they may be of interest to the general reader of the Review.

THE TRIENNIAL GENERAL SYNOD.

This topic, although it came up at a late hour of the session and could not be fully discussed, is one of the most important, as it involves a change in the constitution or

organic law of the Church. For this reason it was sent down to the several Classes for action at their annual meetings in spring.

The German Reformed Church is now sufficiently large to call for such a change in its polity, as will provide for a full and regular representative union of its various sections. At present, the Eastern and Western Synods, although living under the same constitution and using the same doctrinal and ritual standards, are very loosely united by the simple exchange of one delegate at their annual meetings. In the year 1844, a Triennial Convention was formed, which originally embraced also the Dutch Reformed Church, with the view to constitute a closer bond of union and to carry on more efficiently the work of missions, especially in the destitute fields of the West. When the Dutch Church saw fit to withdraw, the two sections of the German Church were more closely drawn together, and the Convention was held between them every third year. The last one met at Winchester, Virginia, in October 1856, and proposed several important suggestions to the respective Synods for consideration. Among these was the plan of merging the Triennial Convention into a regular Triennial General Synod with full legislative power. For, as the Triennial Convention was merely an advisory body and consisted only of a small number of delegates, it could not be expected to accomplish much and to carry out the purpose, contemplated in its original formation. That a closer union between the two Synods should exist, is now generally felt in the West as well as in the East. The plan above alluded to was, therefore, favorably received by both Synods, and will no doubt be carried into effect at no distant day in some form or other.

But now the question arises: Shall we not at once originate a General Assembly after the fashion of the Old School Presbyterian Church, which should meet annually and transact the general business of the Church as the highest legislative and judicial tribunal, to which the separate Synods shall be subordinate? This plan meets with no

favor thus far among us. Too much centralization is always dangerous to freedom in the Church as well as in the State. Large deliberative bodies are expensive and apt to become unwieldy, cumbersome and unmanageable. The idea as proposed by the Convention at Winchester and more fully matured by the committee appointed for the purpose, is rather to save the relative independence of the two Synods, and to provide simply for a General Synod which is to meet every three years only, in some central locality, to take the place of the separate synodical meetings for that year, and to transact the business of both jointly, without constituting thereby a higher judicatory.

The only serious difficulty in the way is the double amount of business, which would thus come before that body and would perhaps require more time than the delegate would be willing or able to spend. It strikes us, that it will be necessary to leave all sectional, subordinate matters with the separate Synods as heretofore, and to limit the business of the Triennial Synod to general questions and enterprises of the Church, which affect the constitution, or relate to the preparation and publication of the standard works of the Church, such as the catechism, liturgy, hymn books, Sunday-school books, &c., also the home and foreign missionary cause, the correspondence with sister churches, especially those in Europe, and disputes which might arise between the several Synods. In this way the Triennial Synod, owing to the character of its business and the larger number of its delegates, would after all become, if not a higher judicatory strictly so called, yet a more important body than either of the separate Synods.

But it is impossible and useless at present to speculate about the precise character of this contemplated assembly. It will gradually define itself at the hand of actual experience. Life produces its own forms, and the soul shapes the body. It is never wise to legislate too much and too far ahead. Let the future take care of itself. God rules history, also the history of the German Reformed Church

in the United States, and this should be enough to inspire us with faith and confidence in the future.

We have no doubt, that the several Classes will adopt the general principle here involved and agree to try the experiment, which can do no harm. In this case the first Triennial Synod would convene, God willing, in the year 1860, and the second in the year 1863. The latter year should be celebrated, as the third centennial of the Heidelberg Catechism, by some noble movement for the benefit of the Church at large, and by the preparation of a standard critical edition of that excellent Catechism in the German, Latin and English languages.

CHANGE OF NAME.

The report on the Triennial General Synod proposes also a double change of name, the one relating to the two Synods, the other to the Church at large.

The first had been suggested already by the Triennial Convention at Winchester, and can be made without difficulty. The Eastern Synod is now officially called the "Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States" (originally "of North America," was added), the Western, the "Synod of the German Reformed Church of Ohio and adjacent States." The former title is too comprehensive, the latter too inconvenient. At present the common distinction of "Eastern" and "Western" Synod would answer all purposes. But this may not be the case in a few years. For, if the German Reformed Church is to progress on the principle of historical development, as we hope and trust she may, we will have in the course of time Synods of the East, of the South, of Western Pennsylvania, of Ohio, of Indiana, of Illinois, of Iowa, of Wisconsin, etc. This matter will have to be settled by the first General Synod in 1860, according to the state of things which may then exist.

The second change is of a more difficult and critical character. It is proposed to substitute for the comparatively recent name "*German* Reformed Church," the original name *Evangelical* Reformed Church" as our general denom-

inational title. On this subject a special committee was appointed by the Synod of Allentown in 1857, which recommended to the Synod of Frederick, to send this subject down to the Classes for their consideration. The Western Synod has already committed itself in favor of the change, and the Synod at Allentown has so far done the same, in ordering the new German Hymn book to be called "Gesangbuch der Evangelisch-Reformirten Kirche," etc. It is thought that the latter title, besides being older and more appropriate in itself, would suit the present condition of the Church much better, since a large portion of it has ceased to be German, and become altogether English as far as the language is concerned, and would be more favorable to its extension in a prevailingly English country like ours. But great caution is necessary, before we can think of making this change general and embodying it in our Constitution. Indeed we are by no means settled in our mind as to its propriety and desirableness. The Dutch Reformed Church, a few years ago, attempted a similar change for similar reasons, but saw fit, after mature deliberation, to abide by its old title.

Theoretically and historically considered, the problem could be easily solved. It is an indisputable fact, that the proposed name, *Evangelical Reformed*, or *Reformed* without any addition, is the original historical name of the Church, and is uniformly used in the ancient and modern catechisms, liturgies and hymn books in Germany and Switzerland,* and in our own American hymn books† except the

*We will give here the titles of a few of the more recent German Reformed hymn books, as specimens to prove this fact:

"Auserlesene Psalmen und Geistliche Lieder fuer die *evangelisch-reformirte* Kirche des Kantons Schaffhausen. Schaffhausen, 1841."

"Auserlesene Psalmen und Geistliche Lieder fuer die *evangelisch-reformirte* Kirche des Kantons Aargau. Aarau, 1844."

"Gesangbuch fuer die *evanglisch-reformirte* Kirche des Kantons Zürich. Zürich, 1853."

"*Evangelisches* Gesangbuch fuer Kirche, Schule und Haus in Basel-Stadt und Basel-Land. Basel 1854."

"*Reformirtes* Gesangbuch. Elberfeld, 1853."

The same is the case with the Liturgies of the various cantons of Switzerland and the different sections of the Reformed Church in Germany.

† For instance, the one printed at Germantown (our copy gives no date), and the one printed in Sumneytown, which is still used in Philadelphia and many congregations of East Pennsylvania.

last, and in the charters of several of our congregations, both German and English. In Europe people never speak of a *German* Reformed Church, but of the *Reformed* Church simply, or of the Reformed Church of Germany, of Switzerland, of France, of Holland, of England, of Scotland, etc. The term *German* Reformed is evidently of American origin and was introduced at a time when the whole Church used the German language, and with the view to distinguish her from the surrounding English Reformed or Calvinistic denominations, and also from the Dutch Reformed Church, with which it was so closely connected in its early history. The latter fact accounts for the German official title "Die *hoch-deutsch*-Reformirte Kirche, which still figures on the title-page of our German Minutes of Synod. It was evidently chosen with reference to the Dutch Church as the *nieder-deutsch*-Reformirte Kirche. But this is a very singular terminology. In Germany itself, the distinction between *hoch-deutsch* and *nieder-deutsch* is by no means equivalent to the distinction between *German* and *Dutch* or *Hollaendisch*, and is not used in an ecclesiastical sense at all, but simply with reference to the two dialects of the German language, the one spoken in the Southern, the other in the Northern parts of Germany. The term *hoch-deutsch* ought, therefore, to be dropped from the Minutes at once, and the simple *deutsch* substituted for it, as altogether sufficient and in fact already generally current in the Church.

But the question assumes a different aspect, if we view it in its practical bearing. The title *Deutsch Reformirt*, and *German Reformed*, however unusual it may sound to the European ear, has become historical and to some extent necessary in America. It was not arbitrarily invented, but grew out of the peculiar relations of our country, for reasons similar to those which led to changes in the titles of other ecclesiastical bodies, which derive their origin from Europe. For the use of the simple title *Reformed*, which, in itself considered, is decidedly the best, even without the addition of *Evangelical*, would imply on our part an improper and intolerable presumption in a land, where we

are surrounded by all the other branches of the Reformed family from Holland, England and Scotland. The Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed and Protestant Episcopal Churches are as much Reformed, in the proper historical sense of the word, and as much Evangelical, too, as we are. It is true, that the title *German* does not apply any more to a large, and, we may say, the most active and influential part of our Church, if we mean by it the exclusive use of the German *language*. But it still designates the national origin of our Church, which cannot be altered by any Synodical legislation, and of which no one need be ashamed. On the contrary, the more our Church has grown within the last twenty years in intelligence and proper self-respect, the more has she learned to honor and cherish her historical connection with the classical soil of the Reformation and of modern Protestant learning and literature. For the same reason the titles of the largest denominations in Christendom, the Greek Catholic and the Roman Catholic, might be objected to, since the Greek and Latin languages are by no means exclusively used in them. And finally, it should be remembered, that the change of name might possibly invalidate our titles to our church property, including the endowment funds of the Seminaries and Colleges, which are chartered as *German* Reformed institutions.

The matter should, therefore, be very carefully investigated in all its legal as well as religious aspects, before Synod takes final action on it. We are not opposed to the change as far as the German title is concerned, since *Reformirt* and *Evangelisch-Reformirt* are decidedly more natural and familiar to the German and Swiss ear than *Deutsch Reformirt*, and could not be misunderstood, since no other *German* denomination of this country calls itself *Reformirt*. Our main difficulty is with the change of the English title, in view of its denominational surroundings and legal obstacles. Unless these objections can be satisfactorily removed, the change of name should not be made.

THE NORTH CAROLINA CLASSIS.

This Classis is composed chiefly of descendants of German Reformed families, who emigrated South from the Eastern Counties of Pennsylvania, but it has long since become entirely English. It numbers several large and substantial charges and able and zealous ministers; but it lies almost too far from the heart of the Church to keep full pace with all its general movements and enterprises. For reasons connected with the theology taught at Mercersburg, it has for several years past kept aloof from the Synod and ceased to send its annual delegation. Attempts were even made to connect it with the Dutch Reformed, and with the Old School Presbyterian Church, but without effect. The Synod, in the spirit of true Christian charity, sent first a pastoral letter, and afterwards, at the suggestion of the Winchester Triennial Convention, a personal delegation to the Classis, kindly admonishing them to return to their former connection.

This movement promises to be crowned with complete success. It was made to appear, from a full and satisfactory report of Synod's Commissioner, who discharged his trust with prudence and discretion, that there is no disposition whatever on the part of the ministers and people of that Classis to separate from the Church of their Fathers, and to give up the time-honored standards of its doctrine and discipline. The suspension of the ecclesiastical intercourse must, therefore, in great part, be attributed to certain misunderstandings. Two ministers of the North Carolina Classis, who were educated at Mercersburg, but are supposed to have taken the lead in the movements hostile to Synod, were sent as Commissioners to the meeting at Frederick; they regularly attended its sessions to the close, and expressed, in appropriate addresses, their attachment to the German Reformed Church, their sense of gratitude for the kind treatment they had received, and the sincere hope and wish to see the former relations fully restored. They will, of course, favorably report to their Classis on the result of their commission, and, unless some new obsta-

cle should be thrown in the way, we may confidently expect, that this distant part of the Church will be represented again by regular delegates at the next annual meeting of Synod at Harrisburg.

The Classis of North Carolina has in its midst a classical academy, advantageously located and chartered as a regular College, which, under proper management, is said to have very fair prospects of success, in view of the absence of other collegiate schools in that district, and the anxiety of the people to have their children educated without sending them to the North. Upon this literary institution must necessarily rest the hope of the Church in that section of the country, and if it should extend much further in the adjoining States, as we hope it may, the best plan would be in the end to constitute it into a separate district Synod of the South. What they need most at present, is an efficient principal of their infant College, and an accession of pious, well-trained and energetic ministers. We hope that some of our young men will direct their attention to that promising field of labor.

CORRESPONDENCE WITH SISTER CHURCHES.

The Synod of the German Reformed Church in the United States has made repeated efforts during the last thirty years, to establish a regular correspondence with the Mother Churches of Germany and Switzerland, from a natural and praiseworthy desire to promote the cause of Christian union, and, with the assistance of our European brethren, to carry on more successfully the missionary operations among the thousands of German immigrants, who are annually thrown to our shores and seek a permanent home in our vast country! The first earnest effort of this kind was the mission of the late Mr. Reily, in 1823. He went to Europe in person as agent for the newly founded Theological Seminary, collected a considerable sum of money and a library, and awakened a deep interest for the welfare of the German churches in this country, even among the most

prominent divines of that day, as the celebrated Drs. Schleiermacher, Neander, De Wette, Lücke, Nitzsch, Ullmann, etc. Unfortunately, the connection was soon broken off, and the occasional letters of Synod sent abroad remained mostly unanswered. The cause of the failure is to be found, however, not so much in the want of a proper regard and interest on the part of our foreign brethren, as in the great distance, the peculiar relations of the European Churches to the respective governments, which deprive them of independent ecclesiastical action, in the want of necessary information of both parties respecting their condition and wants, and especially in the want of a personal representative abroad.

During the last years, however, the German Churches, their theology and literature, have become better known to us, and we have become better known to them, and in proportion to this knowledge, the mutual sympathy and interest has increased. The growing emigration, too, awakened the more active among the Christians in Europe to a lively sense of their spiritual duty to these emigrants, and a number of societies were formed from time to time at Elberfeld and Langenberg, (under the fostering care of a most excellent, wealthy and liberal member of the Reformed Church, the late Mr. Colsman, of Langenberg, and several others,) at Basel, Bremen, Berlin, etc., for the purpose of sending out pious ministers to the destitute German field in America.

In the year 1843, our Synod ventured on a new personal delegation to Germany, consisting of the late venerable Dr. Hoffeditz (whose name will ever be dear to the writer) and the Rev. Dr. Schneck. It forms the first effective link of a more intimate union, whose effects have been felt more or less ever since, although the original and immediate object of the mission, to secure the services of the celebrated Dr. F. W. Krummacher, then at Elberfeld, for the German theological professorship at Mercersburg, was not attained. It is well known, that the King of Prussia showed his interest in the German Reformed Church of America

at that time, by a liberal and unsolicited donation, sufficiently large to defray the travelling expenses of the delegation and the removal expenses of the professor elect. Dr. Krummacher established a periodical, the *Palmblätter*, with the express purpose of exciting and promoting an active interest among the German Christians for their brethren in America. The Prussian Church Government seriously entertained the idea of sending to the German emigrants, missionaries, who might either remain or return after a number of years with the advantage of an American experience. The attention of the *Dom-Candidaten* in Berlin, i. e., those candidates who enjoy the benefit of a stipend for travelling in foreign lands, and then labor for some years as assistant ministers at the cathedral of the Prussian capital, was directed to this country, and one of them, a brother of the distinguished Dr. Hengstenberg, actually visited our German Churches in 1845, with the view to inquire into their spiritual condition and wants. Unfortunately, the official report of that polished and amiable, but somewhat aristocratic gentleman, on the state of American Christianity, was of such a nature as to cool down the interest awakened, and discourage others from following his example. Had the report, as published in a long series of articles in Hengstenberg's Evangelical Church Gazette, and translated with comments for the "Messenger" by Dr. Nevin, been more hopeful, we would probably have had an unbroken series of living representatives of the fatherland among us, and both parties would have reaped the benefit of such a connection. For Germany might learn as much from American Christianity, as America from German theology.

In 1854, the connection was revived under a new form. The German Evangelical Church Diet, which was founded in the memorable revolutionary year 1848, and has been since that time the most complete, commanding and influential annual representation of the best part of German Protestant Christianity, entered, during its seventh meeting at Frankfort on the Main, into a regular correspondence with the

German Churches, and more particularly with the German Reformed Church of the United States. Our Synod was represented at the meeting in Frankfort by a personal delegate, then again by three regular delegates at the Diet of Lübeck in 1856, and by one delegate at the Diet of Hamburg in 1858. Owing to this living representation, and other reasons, the correspondence has been regularly carried on, and is duly noticed in the annual transactions of that body, and also more at length in the official report of its activity in the large field of Inner Mission, 1857, p. 70–80, where our Synod and its relations to Germany are spoken of in the most respectful and fraternal terms. The standing President of the Church Diet, Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, a noblemen of princely fortune, and what is better, a distinguished scholar and statesman, now a member of the Prussian Cabinet,* and what is best of all, a most earnest, humble and devout Christian, has manifested from the beginning the deepest interest in this relation, which is the more to be appreciated as he is not a member of the Reformed, but of the Evangelical Church of Prussia. This correspondence has had already a happy effect, and forms an interesting chapter in the history of our Church. It proclaims the union of faith and love, which still binds the vital Christianity of Germany to its offspring in this country in spite of the intervening ocean; it brought us into felt contact with the movements, trials and progress of the former; it made us better known among our brethren abroad; and it promises to end in the establishment of a permanent *personal* link between the two parties, in case the Theological Tutorship scheme, as adopted at the last meeting of Synod, should go into successful practical operation, as we hope and trust it may.

For the correspondence itself, we must refer the reader to the Minutes of Synod and the transactions of the Church

* According to the latest news from Prussia, the Prince Regent, in reconstructing his Cabinet on the 3d of November, has appointed Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg Minister of Cultus and Public Instruction, which gives him the supreme control of the Ecclesiastical Affairs and the Universities of Prussia.

Diet. The last Synodical letter was accompanied by a translation of the service for the reception of immigrants from our new Liturgy, which had been prepared in response to a recently introduced custom in several German churches of a solemn dismission of emigrants by divine service. But we regret to say, that this particular form does not meet the expectations of our friends in Berlin. They object to it, and very properly too, that it is more adapted to the reception of strangers than brethren of the same faith. It ought to contain a distinct recognition of the community of origin and faith. But this will no doubt be attended to in the final revision of the new Liturgy.

The Synod of Allentown, in 1857, resolved also very properly to open a correspondence with the Reformed Conference of Germany, which was expected to meet this year at Elberfeld, and the Reformed Pastoral Conference of Switzerland, which held its last annual meeting in August at Aarau. Committees were appointed for the purpose, who discharged their duty in connection with some brethren of the Western Synod, and laid a copy of their appropriate and affectionate letters before Synod, which were ordered to be incorporated in the Minutes. But for some cause or other, no reply has been received as yet. The letter to Ger many was probably misdirected, and the letter to the Swiss Conference, sent to the care of Dr. Hagenbach, seems unfortunately to have miscarried, if we are to judge from the report of the late Conference in Hagenbach's *Reformirte Kirchenblatt*, where no notice is taken of such a letter at all. But we have not yet received the full official report, which is sent to us every year by a friend at Basel. We are confident, from personal knowledge of many Swiss ministers, that a letter from Synod, if received in due time, would have been responded to in the kindest spirit. But it is very difficult to carry on such a correspondence at such a distance, without an occasional exchange of a personal delegate, who acts as a living mediator between the two parties. For this reason, also, among many others, the establishment of a Theological Tutorship is very de-

sirable, as it is intended not only to benefit directly our Seminary, but also to form a perpetual and living bond of union between our Church and the German Churches of Europe.

THE THEOLOGICAL TUTORSHIP.

The character of this new scheme to enlarge the usefulness and to increase the efficiency of our Theological Institution, will best appear from the following report of the Committee which had been appointed by the Synod of the preceding year:

The immediate occasion of the Tutorship, to which the consideration of Synod at its last annual meeting was directed by the Classis of Mercersburg, is the generous offer of Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, President of the German Evangelical Church Diet, first made in a more general way, and afterwards especially tendered to our own body, to establish a fund of two thousand Prussian dollars, the interest of which shall aid in sustaining a pious young divine of the German Church in America as a student at the Universities of Germany, with the view to qualify him more fully for the position of a theological teacher in our Seminary.

By way of response to this offer of a noble and distinguished friend in Europe, and by way of reviving, at the same time, the effort of the Alumni Association of our Seminary to found a third Professorship, we recommend the establishment of a *Theological Tutorship*, the nature and object of which will appear from the following particulars:

1. The object of the Tutorship is to increase the teaching force of the Seminary, and to raise the standard of theological education among the students; to be a school for the training of professors in our institutions; and to serve, at the same time, as a perpetual and living bond of union between our Church and the mother Churches of Germany.

2. The Tutorship contemplates the employment and support of a regular succession of two young men, graduates of our literary and theological institutions, and distinguished for diligence, scholarship and Christian character, who shall be simultaneously engaged, the one in completing his theological and general literary education in Europe, the other in teaching, as assistant professor, such branches in our Seminary as may be assigned him, with his own consent, by the Faculty and the Board of Visitors under the sanction and approbation of Synod.

3. Every two years the Board of Visitors of the Theological Seminary, on consultation with the Faculty, shall recommend to Synod one of the graduates of the Seminary duly qualified, and willing to assume the requisite conditions as a candidate for the first term of the Tutorship, who, if elected by Synod, shall visit Europe for two years with the view to prosecute and complete his studies under the general direction of the Faculty in one or more of the principal Universities of Germany and Switzerland.

4. On the return of the first incumbent of the Tutorship from Europe, the Synod, on recommendation of the Board of Visitors, shall elect him Tutor in the Seminary for a period of two years, after which time, the second incumbent on his return shall in like manner succeed him as teaching tutor; and thus a regular succession of travelling and teaching Tutors shall be kept up biennially, as long as the plan may be perpetuated.

5. Before a young man can be appointed for the first period of his Tutorship and be entitled to its benefits, he must submit to an examination before the Board of Visitors in all the branches taught in the Seminary, and sign a written pledge, to be recorded by the Board, that he will faithfully comply with the following conditions: first, to prosecute his studies in the Universities of Europe for two years under the general direction and advice of the Faculty; secondly, to send either to the Faculty or to the Synod, an annual report on the progress of his studies and the state of theology and religion in the old world, especially in the land of our forefathers; thirdly, after his return, to engage, with the consent of Synod and its Board of Visitors, in the active duties of teaching in the Seminary, under the direction of the Faculty and the Board, for a period of two years; and finally, at the expiration of his term of office, to enter the work of the ministry in the German Reformed Church.

6. If, for any reason, the regular biennial succession, as above described, be interrupted, the teaching tutor may be rëelected at the expiration of his term of office for another term of two years; the acceptance of the new appointment, however, to be at his own option.

7. The travelling incumbent of the Tutorship shall receive towards his support during his absence in Europe the sum of at least two hundred dollars annually from the Treasurer of the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and, in addition to it, the annual proceeds of the Bethmann Hollweg-Fund for the time being, provided that the benevolent donor, as we have reason to believe, from the renewal of his offer in a recent letter to Synod, be willing to agree to this arrangement under the present scheme.

8. The teaching incumbent shall receive from the Board of Trustees, the annual salary of four hundred dollars, or more, as the proceeds of the fund may justify, to be paid in like manner as the salary of the Professors. He shall also be entitled to the free use of two rooms in the Seminary building, where he is expected to reside.

9. To provide for this additional annual expenditure of six hundred dollars, and before the scheme can go into full operation, there shall be created a fund of not less than ten thousand dollars, to be called the *Fund of the Theological Tutorship*, and to be safely invested at legal interest by the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and held by them in trust for Synod.

10. If, from any cause, the proceeds of the Tutorship Fund, either in whole or in part, should not be required for its legitimate objects, then the proceeds or surplus, as the case may be, shall be either added to the endowment fund until it be equal in amount to a regular professoral fund, with a view to increase the annual appropriation to the two Tutors, hereafter to be elected, or to be applied to the benefit of the Seminary Library.

11. If the entire scheme of the Theological Tutorship should at any time and for any cause, be given up, or superseded, then the Tutorship Fund shall

either be merged into a Fund for a new regular Professorship in the Seminary, or the annual proceeds of it be devoted in equal shares to the cause of Beneficiary Education and the increase of the Library of the Theological Seminary.

12. In case the Western Synod should see fit to establish a similar Tutorship in her Seminary, the Eastern Synod shall give her the right to one-half of the annual proceeds of the Bethmann Hollweg-Fund, and of any other funds which may be contributed towards it by European friends for the general benefit of the German Reformed Church.

These are the outlines of the Theological Tutorship plan as far as your committee have been able to mature it.

If our Church is to keep pace with the progress of the age and the leading Christian denominations, she cannot long be contented with the present inadequate teaching force of the Seminary, and must aim at a full and complete faculty, which requires at least four professors for the various branches of theology, exegetical, historical, systematic, and practical. The duties of teachers, like those of preachers and public speakers generally, are the same for a small as for a large audience, and even more arduous, because less encouraging. An increase of the faculty would also be one of the surest means to increase the number of students and consequently of ministers for the growing wants of our Church.

The adoption and execution of the Tutorship scheme would be an important step towards this end, and it would answer substantially the purpose of a third Professorship at considerably less expense, and thus secure the object at which the Alumni Association of the Seminary has been aiming for several years. But, in addition to this, it would afford many of our rising ministers a rare opportunity of adding to their American training the invaluable advantages of a European visit and education in the first Universities of the world, and under the patronage of some of the leading men in the Churches of Germany. It would have a tendency to promote generally among our students and ministers a higher grade of scholarship, and so far greatly to raise the standing and efficiency of the Church. It would increase the number of ministers, from whom a choice may be made by the proper authorities to fill the vacant professorships in our literary and theological institutions. It would infuse new life from time to time into our Seminary, and keep it in constant contact with the progress of theological science and literature of Europe. And finally, it would be a permanent practical fruit of the fraternal correspondence of our Synod with the Churches of the fatherland recently established, and perpetuate the union between them by a living chain of delegates and representatives of our Church to Germany.

In conclusion, your committee would remark, that, having received discretionary powers from the last Synod to take preparatory steps towards raising the necessary subscriptions, they intended at first to address a circular to twenty or more individuals in the Church, who might be able and willing either to give or to raise $500 each towards the establishment of such a Tutorship, and thus bring their scheme before Synod with a reasonable prospect of speedy success. But, in view of the continued financial pressure of the country, they thought it best to refrain from the attempt at present, and

to leave it altogether with Synod to devise a suitable plan for raising the necessary fund in case she see fit to resolve upon the establishment of a Theological Tutorship, or upon some other scheme that will permanently increase the efficiency and enlarge the usefulness of the Seminary.

The adoption of the report gave rise to an interesting discussion, which brought out the views and feelings of Synod concerning the movement. One of the reporters appointed by Synod has furnished a clear account of the speeches made, for the "German Reformed Messenger" of November 17, from which we beg leave to transfer the principal part:

"Dr. Gerhart said he would like to see the first part, whether it be regarded in the light of a preamble, or an item, adopted with a view to bring up the general question as to whether the Synod should enter into the arrangement at all.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. Did not the Synod at Allentown determine upon going into this matter?

The President replied, that Synod regarded it favorably, as the appointment of the Committee showed, but did nothing positively. The subject was open for discussion, and any action could be taken that was now thought best.

Dr. Gerhart. Synod's action last year implied a general committal in favor of the general object aimed at. There is nothing in the present report, if adopted, that binds the Church to go forward immediately. Before the plan can go into effect, and a single young man be sent to Germany to prepare himself for the Theological Tutorship, a fund must be established. Let steps be taken for the raising of this fund, and Synod will be ready, if not now, in future, to carry out the plan as drawn up by the Committee, and presented in the report before us.

Elder Rodenmayer. I should like to hear something said, in the first place, pointing out the necessity of a Theological Tutorship.

Rev. S. H. Reid. I hope Dr. Schaff will give us some light on the subject, so that any difficulty existing in our minds may be removed, and the wants of the Seminary, in this direction, be understood.

Rev. J. H. Derr. The establishment of such a Tutorship is necessary. The plan proposed and carried out, would be of incalculable advantage to our Church, as well as to the general interests of Theology in our country. It may be thought by some, that our two Professors are fully competent to the task of instructing all who are preparing themselves for the Gospel ministry. But we ought to expect something more from them than mere teaching. In the sphere of Church History, much more could be done by our worthy Professor, in the way of following up with additional volumes, the one already published. The German Reformed Church has no work on Theology, or Exegesis, at all answering our purposes or mission as a denomination, by any of our Professors or ministers. Such a Tutorship would open the way for the preparation of such works. But if our Professors are con-

fined all the time to the mere routine of instruction from the desk, they will have no time to write books, which would reflect credit on our Church, and be of great benefit to the ministry.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. The plan proposed by the Committee strikes me very favorably. I am pleased with it, and shall vote for it. For thirty years efforts have been made to effect a closer union and establish a correspondence between our Church and the mother country. This will be the most practical way of doing it. The sooner we show those generous friends in Europe, that we appreciate their kind offers, the better. For this reason, as well as the one given by Brother Derr, I am strongly in favor of the adoption of the plan proposed.

Rev. H. Harbaugh called for a second reading of the first paragraphs, so that the whole might be well understood, and Synod be prepared to adopt all that follows.

Dr. Schaff read the report a second time.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. I remember that, thirty years ago, there was an offer made, through our deceased brother Reily, to educate and train some of our young men in one of the German Universities. The demand at that time for ministers was so great that none could be spared. It was felt then, that that was the only way to revive and cherish the affection which ought to exist between our Church and the Church of Germany. The German Reformed Church has cut itself loose from American Theology. I am heartily glad of it. Let us cultivate a deeper knowledge of German Theology. The best way of doing this, is, to have one of our young men, in a course of training abroad, as proposed by your Committee.

Dr. Gerhart. This is a matter of great importance. The Theological Seminary was established in 1825. The German Reformed Church placed one Professor over it, and went forward in that way as long as she could. As soon as the Church felt able, an associate was appointed. Our wants increased, and we have had since Dr. Schaff came to this country two Professors in our Theological Seminary. In 1825, we had in the whole Church eighty ministers—now we have three hundred and fifty. We are growing and increasing as a denomination, and the Seminary must grow also. Two Professors will not be sufficient—a third, and soon a fourth Professorship will have to be filled. It has been well said that we need works on Church History, Theology, Exegesis, &c., for which the life and times will qualify our Professors. We need a class of persons from whom to select our Professors. Our Collegiate and Theological course is not sufficient to prepare men for this post. This is felt most sensibly by those who have been called to these important posts, and must now make up their deficiency as they best can. Dr. Mayer stated to me, that he had continually to go back and supply the deficiency of his early training. For a long time the Church had to look abroad for Professors to serve in her Institutions. When we established our College, we had to go abroad. Dr. Rauch, a ripe German scholar, was then providentially among us. He was chosen, first as Principal of the High School at York, and then advanced to the post of first President of Marshall College. When we needed a Professor of Mathematics, of Natural Sciences, of the Languages, we had to go abroad—away to New England. The tendency of all this was to Puritanize the Church. This state of things continued till Dr.

Nevin effected a change. And even he was called from the Presbyterian Church to the Theological Chair. In this case there was a venture, but we knew not the depth of character of the man of our choice, and the influence he would exert upon us to bring us back to a full comprehension of our true position as a Church. Yet we must say, there is always a risk in taking men from other Churches. It is only within the last few years that we have called our own men. This proposal of von Bethmann Hollweg meets a want which has been deeply felt, and will qualify our own men for any position in the gift of the Church. Drs. Wolff and Schaff will not live forever. Let thes. posts become vacant, and we will be sensible of the difficulty of filling them Let some of our most talented young men spend two years in a foreign Uni versity, and then two more as Tutors in the Seminary, and then send them forth into the field of the ministry. The objection is urged, with much plausibility, that this high training would disqualify them for the simple work of the ministry. But it is not the well-educated man, who is bombastic, mystical and obscure. All is made to turn upon his spiritual character. The more learning a truly devout man has, the better will he be prepared to discharge his pastoral duties. And from these the Church could then select those who are to follow our present Professors. I cannot forbear to remind Synod, that other Churches have been acting on this very plan. Dr. Hodge spent some years in a course of preparation in Europe. Prof. Noah Porter, of New England, was in Europe for some time. I might refer to others. And what is remarkable is, that our Presbyterian and New England brethren have been passing by Edinburg and Oxford, and going to the Universities of Germany. We Germans are as good as the English. We have just as much, if not more, right to the advantages afforded by the German Universities. Our sons have a full right to the very best culture that can be obtained in these Institutions.

Rev. H. Harbaugh. I am strongly in favor of this whole movement, especially after hearing the report read a second time. That report is so well guarded. Although I had some difficulties, they are now removed. I like the course laid down—two years in the University and then two more in the Tutorship. Some minds develop rapidly—others become inflated—this is the danger, and hence much prayer is needed on the part of young men for humility. I was delighted with the manner in which this very thing is guarded in the report. It is not likely that we would be much deceived. We have every reason to believe that the person, who would receive and obtain the encouragement of the Church to go abroad, would be a good, worthy and humble man. With this donation from Europe, we can lay the foundation for the whole scheme. We are greatly deficient. We need to keep up union and intercourse with the fatherland. We need to cultivate the most intimate relations with our brethren abroad. Time was when this land lay far off from us. We are now better acquainted. But this must increase. We must put processes in motion for further advances. Had we some of our young men at the Universities, we would keep posted. One of our greatest duties is the internal mission—the spreading of light. We undervalue too much the necessity of thoroughly educated men. We must have them. They will act as models. It is said

"A thing of beauty is a joy forever."

God knew what he was doing when he made the mountains. There the streams come from, that flow through our valleys. What the mountain is in the sphere of nature, that the truly educated man is in the kingdom of grace. Because the scheme is so well defined and guarded, we can have no hesitancy in adopting the report. Let us go forward in the name of God.

Rev. S. H. Reid. So far as the object aimed at is concerned, I sympathise fully with it, and can endorse every sentiment of the brother from Lancaster. I feel, however, persuaded that the brethren have taken a one-sided view—the most pleasing view, by far. They have not touched any of the difficulties. We may adopt this report, as we have done other plans and schemes, but is it not the most consummate folly for Synod to devise measures and raise expectations which can never be realized? The first question before us is—Is the object aimed at practicable under all the circumstances? Can it be carried out? You want ten thousand dollars in hard cash. You must have it on interest. I ask, where is this endowment to come from, in the midst of the pressure which is felt all around us—all over the country? Would not our Church regard us as a set of crazy men, were we to make such an attempt as the plan proposed calls for? The report may indeed be adopted. But it must be with the condition—*If the money can be raised.* If not, it must go the way of a thousand other reports—fall to the ground. The say-members ought to be consulted. Let us have an expression of their sentiments on this important subject. We see the mountains, with the cooling streams flowing down their sides. All nice and beautiful enough. We may even long to drink of those streams, but here's the difficulty, can we get at them? So in the case before us. Is the plan practicable? Can all this be actualized?

Rev. J. H. Derr. The ears of the brother, who has just taken his seat, have not been very sharp, and his mind exceedingly dull of comprehension, or he would have heard and understood that the scheme was not to be carried out at once. Even as it regards the *hard cash* needed, there is no impracticability—the report is particularly guarded on this point; it may take time to raise the means, and only when this is done, will the plan be carried out. The idea is to adopt it, and then work at it as we have opportunity.

Elder Rickenbaugh. This does not create an absolute debt. If the money is raised, it will go into practice. We have men in the Church, who may devise liberal things, and give us the funds required. If we do not aim high, we will not shoot high.

Rev. J. C. Bucher. I am sorry for the remarks made, calculated to discourage our eldership. The issue has been raised as to its practicability. The report itself is provisional and conditional. In my experience, I have never found much difficulty in raising money for a real, living, needful enterprise. I would rather raise ten thousand dollars for some living reality, than one thousand dollars for brick and mortar. That is something dead, and hence the difficulty. There are wealthy men enough in the Church, who, if they understood this scheme, would generously come forward and give, and thus follow the example of our noble friend in Germany. But if we stop at the threshhold, because we see a lion in the way, and sit down paralyzed with fear, we shall never accomplish anything. Let us at least commence the

foundation, and roll in one stone after another—let us gather the aterial, and in a few years the structure will rise. As it regards the scarcity of young men, that should be no obstacle. How many will it require? Only one every two years. We can certainly spare a young man of approved piety every two years, for such an important object.

Rev. S. H. Reid. All I have heard only confirms me the more in what I have said. If it is practicable, then go forward. But it will be a shame—a burning shame to adopt the report, and then go home, forget all about it, and make no exertions to carry it out. The brother from Mifflinburg is very sanguine of success. Tell me, how will the brethren in Europe look upon us, if we fail? Have we thought of that?

Elder Griffith. This matter should not be put off. Now is the time for action. I do not look upon this plan in any other light, than as perfectly feasible. I have listened attentively, but have not heard a single argument to induce me to vote against it. Strong and weighty reasons have been advanced, why we should embark in the enterprize of establishing a Theological Tutorship. The scheme is based upon the generous offer of a most worthy man, and Christian gentleman in Germany—Bethmann von Hollweg. I had the pleasure of forming his acquaintance in my foreign tour. He is a whole-souled man, and feels a warm interest in our Church. He is willing to do any thing to facilitate and advance our interest in this country. This is a kind offer, and if accepted, may be the means of opening the avenue for other gifts to flow over to us. We must either accept or reject this offer, and inform our European brethren of the result. In travelling through Europe, I met with young men from different countries going to the Universities of Germany. By sending some of our talented and pious students across the waters, we would give character to our Church. I cannot see that the adoption of the report will involve the Church in any difficulty, or trouble. If so, I would say, away with it. I believe that the amount required can easily and readily be made up, if not this year, before a great while. If the proper appeal be made to wealthy merchants and others in the Church, the means, in due time, will be at hand. It is now time to make preparation for this very movement. I would feel mortified after the offer that has been made, if we should reject the report.

Rev. S. H. Reid. That is the way to talk. And it comes from the right man. Very well! Go ahead!

After this general discussion, the report was taken up, item by item, and unanimously adopted. The Committee was continued, with instructions to carry out, if possible, the plan suggested by them for securing the endowment of the Tutorship. They intend accordingly to issue an appeal to that effect to the ministers and a number of wealthy and liberal members, hoping that it will meet with a prompt and hearty response. The question now is: Can twenty individuals be found in our communion, who are willing

to give, or to raise in their charges and among their friends, the sum of $500 each—only one-fourth of the offer of Dr. von Bethmann Hollweg, who never was in America, and is not even a member of the German Reformed Church—payable in three or five annual installments, with interest, say from October 1st, 1859, for such a noble and useful enterprise? If any one can suggest to the chairman or another member of the Committee a more practicable plan for raising the necessary funds, the suggestion should be made without delay, and shall receive proper attention. So much is certain, that Synod, after having given the Tutorship scheme such a full and hearty sanction, should feel in honor bound to carry it into practical effect. A failure of the movement, from want of liberality, would be injurious to her reputation at home and abroad.

If the endowment can be but half effected during the present Synodical year, the Synod at Harrisburg might proceed to elect the first Tutor, (who should be an ordained minister, enjoying already the general confidence of the Church, and able to give more weight to the scheme at home and abroad,) and send him to Europe for two years, during which time the other half of the endowment might be raised for the support of the teaching Tutor. We are disposed to believe that the Tutorship should be continued, even if the Seminary should ever reach, as we hope it may, a full organization of four or five Professors, like the Old School Presbyterian Seminaries at Princeton, Alleghany, Danville and Columbia, the New School Presbyterian Seminary at New York and Auburn, the Congregational Seminaries at Andover, the General Episcopal Seminary at New York, the Dutch Reformed Seminary at New Brunswick, and almost every respectable Seminary in the country. For, as stated in the report, the Tutorship, like the office of the *Repetenten* in Tübingen, the *Domcandidatenstift* at Berlin, and the *Fellowships* at Oxford and Cambridge, answers several important objects which can not be reached by the regular professorships.

REMOVAL OF THE SEMINARY.

When the question of removing the Literary Institutions to a more central and accessible location was first agitated in 1849, it was understood that the Seminary should go with the College. But for important reasons, the former was left to remain at Mercersburg, where it has ample accommodations in the way of buildings; and where, amidst severe trials and determined opposition from without and within, it acquired its present reputation and standing among the Theological Institutions of America. Even if it should be removed, the name and associations of its retired, healthy and beautiful birthplace will be dear to its alumni, and can never be erased from the history of the German Reformed Church in this country. The main, and perhaps the only weighty objection to its present location, is the difficulty of access and several literary and social disadvantages connected with the same, which will probably never be fully removed, even if certain railroad projects should be carried out.

The question of removal came before Synod by way of request from Lancaster Classis, in whose territory Marshall College has within the last five years found a new and permanent home. But it was evidently not ripe for action, and hence a committee was appointed to inquire into all its legal and pecuniary aspects, and to report to the next annual meeting. It seems to be generally felt at present that, however desirable the removal of the Seminary may be, both for its own sake and for the sake of the College at Lancaster, it should not take place except with the amicable consent of the Mercersburg community, and with a certain prospect of obtaining an equivalent for the loss which may be sustained in the transfer or sale of the Seminary buildings. In the further progress of this affair, we do not wish to take any active part, but we shall cheerfully acquiesce in any action Synod may see fit to take, after a careful consideration of all the interests involved in the case.

THE NEW LITURGY.

The new Liturgy has now been before the Church for about a year, as a provisional and tentative production. Synod has taken no action on it at all, and the book has not yet come before it in proper form, and may not for some time to come. But, at the request of the East Pennsylvania Classis, one step was taken at the last meeting, which indirectly commits it to the book as a provisional production, without giving it its sanction as the ultimate standard of the Church. We mean the appointment of a committee for the translation of the Liturgy in full, (with the exception, of course, of the hymnological appendix) into the German language, that the German membership might have an equal opportunity of examining and using it as the English. This is no more than right and just to a large portion of the Church, and especially to the oldest Classis. The committee is judiciously selected, and includes several able and respected ministers of European and American birth and training. We sincerely wish them success, and hope they may not only translate, but also publish the book in a neat and decent form during the present Synodical year. The only objection urged against the motion, was the expense of publication. But it was stated that the German portion of the Church is even more anxious to obtain the book than the English, and if the German ministers take the proper steps, as many of them will do no doubt, to circulate it as a *family* prayer book in their charges, it may possibly sell more extensively than the English. For every pious German family desires a prayer book next to the Bible and hymn book, and it is reasonable to suppose, that they would greatly prefer one from their own Church to similar works of other denominations.

This action of Synod is an unmistakable indication that the new Liturgy is silently and surely gaining ground in the Church, and meets its approbation, at least as to its general plan and principal services, to a larger extent than we had expected. This does not exclude, of course, the pros-

pect of a revision and modification in unessential features. When the book first came out, it was violently assailed, with more zeal than knowledge, from some quarters * in the pages of the "Messenger." But the opposition seems to have exhausted itself, so as to supersede the necessity of a defense. Some portions of the book were used during Synod, at the communion and ordination of two candidates, and seem to have made a deep and solemn impression. It might be proper, also, to state, that the defendant in the Mount Washington appeal case did not take ground, as had been expected by several brethren, against the Liturgy itself, but simply against its introduction at a particular church at the present time, on the ground of inexpediency. As to the book itself, he expressly stated that he esteemed it more highly now than he did a year ago, and habitually used it in his family.

Perhaps in another year or two the way may be prepared for Synod to take some direct and definite action on this book. But even in this case the work of final revision may still require several years more, until it can be adopted and enjoined as a standard of public and private worship. Nothing can be lost by delay in such an important matter. In the mean time, the ministers have all the liberty they can possibly desire; they may use the provisional book entire, or in part, or not at all, as their own judgment and inclination, and a just regard to the wishes of their respective consistories and congregations, may suggest. The apprehension of discrepancy and confusion is entirely unfounded; as there is less of it now than there was before, when about half a dozen English and German Liturgies were made use of in various parts of the Church, where now the new Liturgy has taken the place.

* The opposition came mainly from one and the same source under three different signatures. It is but just to state, however, that the good brother in question is in the *habit* of changing his signature—not his style, and had no intention to make a false impression upon the readers. His objection, too, was mainly directed to the Litany and to the first regular Sunday service, which, however, is expressly left optional in the rubric, which he seems to have overlooked.

THE NEW GERMAN HYMN BOOK.

In the year 1841, the Synod ordered the preparation of a new German Hymn Book, which appeared already in the following year at Chambersburg. This book may be superior to its American predecessors and cotemporaries, and is, upon the whole, as good as any other German American collection, excepting the more recent one of the Lutheran Synod of Pennsylvania, prepared by Dr. Demme, in 1849, on the basis of the new hymn book of Würtemberg. The compilers certainly did the best they could under the circumstances, and deserve the thanks of the Church for their labor of love. But the undertaking itself was decidedly premature. For at that time the great hymnological reform movement had hardly begun in Germany, and had not yet reached this country, where there was no hymnological library of any account, and no opportunity for proper hymnological training. Even the new Lutheran hymn book of 1849, although the best heretofore published in the United States, appeared a few years too soon for its own good; for it embodies all the defects and errors of the Würtemberg hymn book of 1842, and of the first edition of Knapp's *Liederschatz*, (now entirely superseded by the second edition of 1850,) and none of the results of the progress made within the last ten years in this department. Hence it hardly presents a single one of the ancient classical hymns, not even those of Luther, in the original form, but with all sorts of unnecessary and even hurtful abridgments and mutilations.

Owing to a variety of objections, which we do not wish to specify, the Chambersburg collection, like the Liturgy of the late venerable Dr. Mayer, could never work its way into general favor, nor supersede altogether its predecessors and rivals. Hence there are at present, probably, not less than half a dozen German hymn books in use in the various sections of the German Reformed Church in America; the old one, published by Mr. Benner, (a Lutheran,) at Sumneytown, and enriched with an appendix by the Rev. Dr. Mann, and the so-called *Gemeinschaftliche Gesangbuch*, (which,

in itself considered, is absolutely below criticism, but was likewise enriched some time ago with an appendix from some unknown hands,) still hold their place in the greater part of East Pennsylvania, while other congregations, especially in the West, use imported hymn books from Germany, (as the new and excellent Reformed hymn book of Elberfeld, or that of Schaffhausen,) or the recent collection of the Dutch Reformed Church, prepared by Rev. Mr. Guldin, and published with the tunes in very fine style, or the new Lutheran hymn book (as is the case even with the German Reformed St. John's congregation at Chambersburg).

To make an end to this confusion, and to secure a work that should be adapted to the present state of scientific hymnology in Germany, and to the practical wants of the Church in this country, the Synod, which convened at Chambersburg in 1855, finally yielded to the often repeated request of the East Pennsylvania Classis, and appointed a committee to prepare a new hymn book. The Western Synod heartily fell in with the movement, and was represented by one of its ablest and worthiest German ministers. The committee included men who had paid considerable attention to the subject of hymnology long before, and had closely followed the recent efforts of the revived Churches of Germany, to wrest these invaluable treasures of devotion from the profane hands of rationalists and sentimental pseudo-reformers, and to restore them to the people in their original purity, unction and vigor, with such changes only as are demanded by the laws of grammar, the improvement in taste and a just regard to practical use. They have been more or less at work since their appointment, agreed upon the critical principles, matured a general plan, which was adopted by the Synod at Allentown, and completed their labors during the last year. They reported accordingly to the Synod at Frederick, that the manuscript was ready for the press, that they had already made preparatory arrangements with Messrs M. Kieffer & Co., at Chambersburg, for its publication, and requested Synod

simply to settle definitely the terms of publication with that printing firm, which claims the exclusive and unconditional right of publishing all the Synodical works, both present and prospective, authoritative and provisional, in virtue of a contract entered into in 1849, and extending to 1863.

Of the merits of the work, we are not the judges. But, as the chairman of the committee, we will state, by way of description and information, that the new collection embraces about five hundred classical hymns, of all ages of the Church, including metrical translations of select Psalms, the best Greek and Latin hymns of the ancient Church, the original German hymns of the Reformation period; and the seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth centuries—representing the Lutheran, Reformed, Evangelical and Moravian Churches; also, old or new translations of a number of favorite English hymns of Watts, Cowper, Newton, Wesley, Heber and Montgomery. The rich treasures of German Reformed hymnology, of a Joachim Neander, Lampe, Tersteegen, Lavater, Adolf and Fred. W. Krummacher, J. P. Lange and Meta Heusser, were much more largely drawn upon than is the case in most German hymn books, especially, also, in the recent *Eisenacher Entwurf*, where the Lutheran element unduly predominates, and where, among one hundred and fifty hymns, only four of Reformed authors have been found worthy of a place. Several newly published and unpublished hymns of Mrs. Dr. Meta Heusser, of Zürich, who is acknowledged by Knapp, Koch, and other competent judges, to be the most gifted, and the most deeply spiritual female poet of the German tongue, will be found a valuable accession, and will become, in a short time, generally popular, as her sublime resurrection hymn: "Lamm des gelitten, and Löwe der siegreich gerungen," embodied in the new Würtemberg hymn book, has become already. The text has been taken from the best sources, and as much as possible in its original purity, without any unnecessary alterations and abridgments. This has been by far the most difficult part of the labor. Great attention

has also been bestowed upon a clear, simple, yet logical and complete arrangement, which combines the order of the Apostles' Creed, and the order of the ecclesiastical year. Under each division and subdivision, the hymns are arranged in chronological order (a new feature), so that the reader can trace the unbroken current of piety and devotion from the sweet singers of Israel through the age of martyrs and confessors, the twilight of the middle ages, to the period of the Reformation, and down through the various evangelical denominatins to the revived faith and sacred poetry of the present generation. The several hymns are furnished with the name of the author, and the date of their composition, or first publication, as far as this could be ascertained, which, in many cases, has been an exceedingly troublesome and perplexing task. There will be added, also, an alphabetical list of the principal hymn writers, with biographical notices, a list of the tunes, the usual indexes, and perhaps, also, a hymnological introduction. The committee have used the best scientific and popular hymological works of Bunsen, Daniel, Knapp, Koch, Lange, Stier, Wackernagel, Stip, Raumer, Schirks, etc., and a large collection of ancient and modern German and Swiss hymn books, although in the critical part of their labor, they had often to regret the want of a hymnological library—such as that of Berlin, or that of Wernigerode, in possession of the Stolberg family.

Yet, with all the time and labor bestowed upon this work, the committee are too well aware of the intrinsic difficulty of the task, and the existing conflict of opinions and tastes, as to order, arrangement, number, and the critical restoration of the text, to expect that it will at once give general satisfaction. They offered, therefore, the work, as is usual in such cases in Germany, simply as a *provisional* book for the present (as an *Entwurf*), like the new Liturgy, until the book is sufficiently tried by actual use to enable Synod intelligently to pass final judgment upon it as an authoritative standard of the Church.

Had the new hymn book been left to seek its own way

into the public without any interference, like the new Liturgy was permitted to do—and there is certainly no good reason for making a distinction between them in respect to this point—it would probably have left the press by this time, in good and creditable style, without any cost to Synod, not even for the expenses incurred in its preparation, and with a reasonable prospect of yielding it an annual bonus for beneficiary education, or some other benevolent enterprise of the Church East and West. But the general controversy on the relation of Synod to the Printing Establishment at Chambersburg, with which this innocent book was reluctantly, though inevitably, mixed up, in consesequence of a Synodical resolution of 1857, could not be settled at the last meeting of Synod, and was referred to the next annual meeting. Consequently, the publication of the book was arrested, and made to depend upon the future settlement of a foreign question. But as the committee were anxious to have this devotional work disconnected from any further complication with a purely legal and financial controversy and its uncertain issues, they asked and obtained leave to withhold the manuscript, and to be discharged as a committee.

This result will be very unsatisfactory to those numerous German ministers and congregations, who have for years past been anxiously looking forward to a new German hymn book. But we cannot help it, and must make the best of the case, mindful of the old German proverb: *Aufgeschoben ist nicht aufgehoben.* As matters now stand, the Chambersburg hymn book is still the authorized book of the Church. The new hymn book may be published, indeed, at any time, yet not as the work of the German Reformed Church, either authoritative or provisional, nor even as the work of a Synodical committee, which, as such, is dissolved, but simply as a private production and on private responsibility. The Synod, however, at whose order and for whose benefit the book was prepared, can call it up, either as manuscript or as a printed volume, whenever she chooses, and take such action on it as she may see fit.

The authors, whenever requested to do so, will cheerfully place their work at her disposal, provided only that the controversy alluded to be first adjusted on general grounds, without any further reference to the German hymn book.

OTHER TOPICS OF DISCUSSION.

A variety of other important questions and items of business were brought before the Synod of Frederick, which, from want of time and space, we can only briefly notice in conclusion. We may, however, refer the reader, who feels more particularly interested in them, to the full and carefully prepared articles of official reporters, which have for several weeks past appeared in the "German Reformed Messenger," and which, for the first time, supply the defect of which we complained of in the beginning of this article, more than one half of which was written before we found out that Synod had appointed special reporters.

1. The Mt. Washington Appeal Case occupied a large share of attention, and elicited much animated discussion. It was, unfortunately, mixed up with a series of personal difficulties and irrelevant issues, but involved mainly the important question of the extent of clerical authority, and the right of an ordained minister to administer the sealing ordinances of the Church outside of a regular organization. This question was ably discussed on both sides, and will be brought up again at the next meeting of Synod. The appeal itself was fortunately withdrawn, and Synod thus released from the necessity of voting against the appellants, or against the defendants, and in either case unwillingly to injure such a useful and flourishing institution as the Female Seminary at Mt. Washington, Md.

2. The Printing Establishment controversy, concerning the relation of Synod to the firm of M. Kieffer & Co., with reference to new publications, or the exact meaning of the article in the contract between Synod and said company, which provides that the "*Synod shall give all its print-*

ing into the hands of the firm." The committee brought in two reports, which took opposite views on this subject. Leaving out subordinate issues, such as the difference between present and prospective, and between authoritative and provisional publications of Synod, the controversy turned mainly on the following questions: first, whether the article in dispute is to be understood absolutely and unconditionally, or as subject to those general laws and principles which regulate the book trade; secondly, whether the article supersedes the necessity of separate contracts and excludes Synod from making or asking any terms, or whether each book makes its own contract according to its inner merits and commercial prospects, since books evidently differ in both respects, and since Messrs. M. Kieffer & Co. themselves publish the different Synodical books on different terms, assuming all the risk in the case of the hymn books and catechisms, half the risk and half the profit in the case of the "Lord's Portion," and no risk at all in the case of the Minutes of Synod; thirdly, whether it is unreasonable for Synod to ask any bonus for an old or new book, in view of the fact of her being half owner, in prospect, of the entire property and profits of the establishment, and in view of the past financial embarrassments under which the present firm originally assumed its management, or whether Synod, in furnishing a new and profitable book, and thus increasing the productive capital of the firm, is not entitled to a legal percentage, as much so as any other author for his own work, or as the members of the firm themselves are justly entitled to the annual interest accruing from their pecuniary investment in the establishment; and finally, whether it is a wise policy for Synod to permit all its share of the profits to be invested in the real property and working capital of the establishment, since it is in a solvent and flourishing condition, or to insist now on that other article of the contract, which provides for the annual distribution of the net proceeds between the two partners. Synod saw fit to postpone action on this controversy, and to refer it to a new committee,

with instructions to report at the next annual meeting. It is to be hoped that this committee may agree upon a plan which will maintain the rights of Synod, and the independence and dignity of literary labor, without injuring the Printing Establishment, or discouraging its present faithful and efficient managers, and which will thus prevent any future collision in the publication of the German Liturgy, the Child's Catechism, and other prospective, provisional or authoritative works of Synod.

3. The old question of the VALIDITY OF HERETICAL BAPTISM, and the reception of schismatic congregations into regular communion with the Church. This was satisfactorily disposed of to meet a certain case within the limits of the Goshenhoppen Classis.

4. The HOME MISSIONARY OPERATIONS, in spite of many discouragements, are enlarging every year, especially in the far West, and call upon the increased activity of the Church in providing not only the necessary funds, but also the necessary *men* to take charge of the destitute fields of labor.

5. The question of providing for a SHORTER COURSE OF STUDY, in or out of the Seminary, for persons of limited means or advanced age, and with the view to increase the number of laborers for the home missionary field. This important item was likewise referred to the next Synod for action.

6. The appointment of a committee to prepare a plan for a regular series of DENOMINATIONAL PUBLICATIONS, translated and original, for general circulation among our people, which, it must be confessed, are not yet a reading people to the same extent as could be desired. It is to be hoped that a Church Literature, which speaks to their mind and heart in their own familiar sounds, will tend greatly to stir them up, and to make them more intelligent, zealous and efficient in every good cause. The Western enterprise, of establishing a denominational *Sunday School* paper, was likewise encouraged for the same reason.

6. The APPOINTMENT OF EDITORS of our Church papers,

an associate editor of the "Messenger," and an editor of of the "Kirchen Zeitung." In both cases the election fell upon the right men, and was made unanimous.

From the variety and importance of these various topics, which were brought to the notice of the Synod at Frederick city, it is evident that the German Reformed Church is still proceeding on the theory of historical development, and has a great amount of work before it. In view of this fact, we ought to rejoice and to go torward with new courage and devotion in the name of the Lord, doing His will, and laboring in His holy service, until He calls us from the Church militant on earth to the Church triumphant in heaven.

Mercersburg, Nov. 20, 1858. P. S.

ART. II.—THE HEIDELBERG CATECHISM—ITS FORMATION AND FIRST INTRODUCTION IN THE PALATINATE.

Two names have been applied to the catechism before us; and under both these names it is frequently referred to in history. It is often called the Palatinate Catechism, because it was prepared in the Palatinate for its churches and schools, and was in that country first introduced and used. It is called more generally the Heidelberg Catechism, from the celebrated city of Heidelberg, on the Neckar, where it was composed by its learned and pious authors, where it was first laid before a national Synod and by it examined and approved, and where also it was first printed and published.

The Heidelberg Catechism owes its existence to the zeal and piety of Frederick III., Elector of the Palatinate, with great propriety surnamed "The Pious." He succeeded the Lutheran, Otto Henry, who died in 1559, and in 1560 espoused the Reformed faith. The Prince, as well as his subjects in the Palatinate, had been Lutheran, but at the

same time under the influence of a strong and pretty extensive leaning toward the Reformed views, under the Melanchthonian type, on the subject of the Lord's Supper. This tendency had been greatly increased by the ill-tempered and fanatical zeal which Hesshuss and others manifested in favor of the Lutheran view. Their intolerance toward the Reformed element increased the sympathy of the Prince and many of his subjects for the irenical and conciliatory tenets of the Reformed; and it was deeply felt that both their convictions and their desire for permanent peace required the establishment of the Reformed faith in the Palatinate.

This movement needed a new catechism to give it unity and permanency. Two causes, according to Alting, made a new symbol of faith necessary. First, besides the catechism of John Brentz, strongly Lutheran, which Otto Henry had directed to be used, Hesshuss had also, on his own authority, introduced Luther's Catechism, to which others, according to their own caprice, had added still other catechisms, which gave occasion for much contention. Secondly, it was necessary, still more particularly, that one harmonious form of doctrine and mode of teaching might be enjoyed throughout the Palatinate, in which, besides other points of faith, especially those relating to the person of Jesus Christ, and to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, might be explained clearly and in their true sense.* Moreover, the Augsburg Confession would not answer the purpose; for, although the Prince had himself subscribed it in true faith, yet he felt that if it was to be taken in the sense in which it was explained by the rigid Lutheran party, both he and the Palatinate generally belonged to a different faith.

A certain anonymous writer expresses the opinion, that in the formation of the Heidelberg Catechism, Frederick had in view the design of uniting the Reformed and Luther-

* Catechetische Historie der Gereformeerde Kerke, Door Joh. Christophorus Koecher. Te Amsterdam, 1763, pp. 270–271.

ans, and of preventing further growth of the rupture.* Samuel Diestius, in like manner, supposes that the object of the Prince was by it to harmonize his own theologians with these of the Lutheran Church.† Such a purpose would agree with the amiable spirit of the noble Prince, as also with the animus of the catechism itself.

A catechism or symbol of faith was in any case needed. By a wonderful working of the Divine Spirit, always the formative power in history, the peculiar Christian life of the Palatinate had clearly reached a stage of development alike above Lutheranism and Zwinglianism; and it was necessary for the catechism to be of a type, not to unite these, but to embody and express the deepest and best elements of both, which history had already made one in a ground deeper than that upon which their separation rested. Upon the production of such a catechism, the pious Prince had set his heart. For such a work, God had already provided him the right men, Ursinus and Olevianus, his theological professor and his court-preacher. Both of these eminent men were yet comparatively young, having scarcely reached the twenty-sixth year of their age, and had but a short time previous been called by the Prince to Heidelberg.

In order to accomplish the work laid upon them by the Prince, Olevianus, as well as Ursinus, composed a special treatise—Olevianus his Divine Covenant of Grace, and Ursinus, after Luther's example, a smaller and larger catechism, in which he made essential use of the Emden catechism of De Lasky, and the Genevian catechism of Calvin, which last one was afterwards translated into German, at the same time with the Heidelberg Catechism, in order thus to prove the agreement between the Palatinate and Genevian doctrine. Thus, in the preliminary work and in the substance of the catechism, the spirit and labors of both these divines are to be recognized. Ursinus, however, whose

* Zie Joh. Petri Niceron, Memoires pour servir a l'Histoire des hommes illustres, Tom. XLI, p. 397. Quoted by Koecher.

† De lite et pace Religiosa Evangelicorum—Disput. I., p. 132, Disput. II., p, 160. Quoted by Koecher.

plan received the preference, performed the duty of drawing up the catechism out of these preliminary works of both.

The noble and pious Prince possessed both the ability and the will to render direct and positive assistance in the composition and completion of the catechism. That he did so, we have the best historical proof. The theologians of Heidelberg, in statements called forth by Roman Catholic strictures on the Heidelberg Catechism, and presented to the Regent Rittmayer, say: "Although the Prince had engaged the Palatinate theologians, Ursinus and Olevianus, to prepare the catechism, they were not at liberty to put anything in it which he did not approve."

There is still in existence, says this same statement, a memorandum written in his own hand, from which it may be seen, that even the language had to receive the approval of the Prince. In this paper he says: "The answer in the catechism to the question, '*Do then, the bread and wine, become the very body and blood of Christ?*' (Question 78) read thus: 'Just as little as at first the body of Christ became real natural bread, when he called himself the true bread, whilst nevertheless, in so saying, his words remained true.' This answer is taken nearly word for word from the Greek dialogues of Theodoret. It has, however, been altered, and made as it now stands, that no one might suppose we intended to make of the Sacrament a mere representation or picture, even though the contrary is plainly taught in the following question. Should this catechism, with this single change, be received, I would not only agree to it, but it would, as I hope, most of all conduce to the honor of God and to my especial pleasure."*

The circumstances under which this excellent symbol was produced, and the character of the men who were at the same time the organs of the religious age and of the Divine Spirit, wonderfully conspired in making it the flower and fruit of the entire German Reformation. It has Lutheran inwardness, Melanchthonian clearness, Zwinglian

* Koecher, 272–273.

simplicity, and Calvinistic fire, all fused together. In the beautiful combination of all these elements, it loses the peculiar and distinctive spirit of each one. It has no prototype in any of the Reformers. Zurich and Calvin can say, It is not of us. It has the suavity, but not the compromising spirit of Melanchton—the Prince himself, it is said, took care that it should not be without some sharp points. It has not the dashing terror and dogmatism of Luther. What is strangest of all, it is farthest possible removed from the scholasticism and rigid logic of Ursinus. Though it has the warm, practical, sacred poetical fervor of Olevianus, it has not his fire and flame. It is greater than reformers. It is purer and sounder than theologians. It is rather the product of faith and piety, than of knowledge and theology.

When the catechism had received its finish from its authors, it was placed in the hands of the Prince, who immediately, in 1562, assembled at Heidelberg a Synod of the superintendents and ministers of the whole Palatinate, before whom he laid the precious document, requesting them to subject it to a careful examination, that they might be able to express a correct judgment in regard to it. This they did in various sessions; comparing it conscientiously with the word of God. They were astonished, says Van Alpen, at the wisdom which reigned in it, and the correct manner in which it expressed the Reformed teachings, approved and praised it as with one mouth, and besought the authorities of the land to have it printed.

The original was prepared in the German language, its authors being Germans, and best able to write in that language. At the time of its approval in the Synod of Heidelberg, measures were also taken to have it translated into Latin, that it might also be used in the Latin Schools, Gymnasii and Colleges in the Palatinate. This work was entrusted to Joshua Lagus, a minister in Heidelberg, and Lambertus Pithopaeus, a skillful school teacher, who had been called thither from Deventer. As this translation was in a short time completed, the catechism was issued in both

languages, German and Latin, in January, 1563, under order of the Palatinate Prince, and with this title: "Catechism, or Christian Instruction, as this is conducted in the Churches and Schools of the Palatinate. Printed in the Palatinate city, Heidelberg, by John Mayer, 1563." Both the German and Latin may, therefore, in a certain sense, be regarded as the original, yet pre-eminently this honor belongs to the German.*

The communication of the Prince was printed as a preface. As this interesting document has not to our knowledge appeared in the English language, we give it entire, in such translation as we have been able to make.

"FREDERICK, THE THIRD, Palsgrave and Elector, an order, in relation to the Heidelberg Catechism, to all the Ministers and School Teachers.

WE, FREDERICK, OF THIS NAME THE THIRD, BY THE GRACE OF GOD, Palsgrave at the Rhine, Arch Steward of the Holy Roman Empire, and Elector, Duke of Bavaria, &c., to all and each of our Superintendents, Pastors and Ministers, Teachers in Churches and Schools throughout our Electorate, the Palatinate on the Rhine, we present our grace and greeting, and herewith to you make known:

Inasmuch as by the teachings of God's word, and also by our natural duty and circumstances, we acknowledge ourselves bound to order and carry forward that office calling and government with which God hath invested us, not only for the confirmation of peace and the preservation of well-regulated, upright and virtuous conduct and life among our subjects; but also, and chiefly, more and more to instruct and advance them in the true knowledge and fear of Almighty God and His saving word as the only foundation of all virtue and obedience, we have undertaken hereby most earnestly to incite them to spare no pains, as far as

* Offchoon nu, op deeze wyze, die beide Uitgaaven des Heidelbergchen Catechismus, de Latynsche zoo wel als de Hoogduitsche, voor oorsprongkelyke Uitgaaven van denzelven konden gehouden worden, zoo verklaart eehter Henricus Altingius (in Historia de Ecclesiis Palatinis, Cap. XLIII, XLIV., p. 82, seq.): *Sed authentica est sola* editio Germanica, *in qua omnia non rotundiora modo, sed etiam* εμφατικωτερα *sunt.* Koecher, p. 274.

possible to promote their own eternal as well as temporal welfare, and by these means to aid and sustain them. We, however, ascertained immediately in the beginning of our reign, that, although our beloved predecessors, Palsgraves, Counts, Electors, &c., of blessed memory, had introduced every manner of useful regulations and preparatory measures, for the promotion of the honor of God, and the maintenance of civil and social order—nevertheless, the same were not everywhere carried out with that earnestness which the case required, much less followed by such fruit as was hoped and desired. This has, therefore, induced us, not only to renew these, but since necessity demands it, to devise improvements, and endeavor to make further provision for advancing these noble aims. We have also found that the blooming youth everywhere, both in the schools and churches of our Electorate, have been much neglected in their Christian training; some have not been instructed at all, others very imperfectly, having not been confined to a uniform, clear and sure system of catechization, but have been irregularly directed, according to the free fancy of each instructor.

From this course of things, besides manifold other evils, it has often followed that they have grown up without the fear of God and knowledge of His word, having no regular instruction; and were thus often burdened with other unnecessary general questions, and also at times misled by perverse doctrines. Since now, both Christian and civil offices, rule and government, can not otherwise be maintained, and since order and honesty, as well as all other excellent virtues among subjects can only spring up and increase, when first and above all things the young are brought up in a uniform acquaintance with the pure doctrines of the Holy Gospel, and a thorough knowledge of God, and are statedly exercised therein: we have regarded it as highly necessary to pay proper attention to this, as the most prominent duty belonging to us as ruler, that all inequalities and whatever is wrong may be set aside, and all necessary improvements introduced

Accordingly, with the counsel and assistance of our entire Theological Faculty in this place, also of all the Superintendents and prominent Pastors, we have caused to be prepared from the word of God, a summary of instruction, or catechism of our Christian religion, both in the German and Latin language, in order that henceforth not only the youth in churches and schools may be instructed to their salvation in the Christian religion, and steadfastly practiced therein, but also, that the Pastors and School Teachers themselves may have at hand a sure and permanent form and measure of faith, that they may know how they ought to proceed in the instruction of youth, and not daily, according to their own pleasure, introduce changes or perverse doctrines.

Herewith, we therefore graciously and earnestly exhort and direct each one specially, with grateful good will to receive this catechism or instruction prepared and presented for the honor of God and for the good of our subjects, as also for the benefit of your own souls; and further, that you diligently impart the teachings of the same to the young in school and church, and otherwise, from the pulpit expound it to the common people; that all may teach, act, and live according to its doctrines, which we firmly hope and believe will be the case, if the young, from their early life, are thus zealously instructed and trained in the word of God. May the Almighty God grant to all improvement in right living, and promote each one's temporal and eternal welfare.

Dated at Heidelberg, on Tuesday the 19th of January, and after the birth of Jesus Christ, our dear Lord and Saviour, in the year one thousand five hundred and sixty-three.

[L. S.] FREDERICK.

This first edition, copies of which are now very rare, had much peculiar to itself, which differed from future, and our present editions. It differed in form, arrangement and language. The common division into Lord's Days is not found. The questions are not separated and numbered;

but questions and answers closely follow each other. The proof texts are few in number, and mostly of very indirect application. The 80th question is entirely wanting.

This first edition was soon exhausted, and a second published at Heidelberg in the same year. This edition was so much like the first, that it might be taken as the same, did we not read on the last page as follows: "What was inadvertently omitted in the first edition, as especially page 55, is now added by direction of the gracious Prince." By reference to this page, it is found that it is the 80th question which was wanting in the first edition.* "Thus the Prince," remarks Van Alpen, "had now already more courage. This question, which he had perhaps left out on account of such as had Popish proclivities, he now fearlessly directed to be printed." Still, the conclusion of this question was not the same as it now stands in our catechism. It ended thus: "And the mass at bottom is nothing else than an idolatrous denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ."†

Still another, the third edition, seems to have been published at Heidelberg in the year 1563. It is found that in an edition of that year, the 80th question is again slightly different in its conclusion, thus: "And the mass is thus at bottom nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and suffering of Jesus Christ, and an accursed idolatry."

Hieronymous Van Alpen investigates this point with great pains, calling into counsel various old editions and translations, in order to ascertain at what time these small but important changes were made. He finds at length a

* Dat in de allereerste Uitgaave van onzen catechismus te Heldelberg in den Jaare 1563, de gemelde vraag, uit onbekende en thans bezwaarlyk naa te vorschene oorzaaken, weggelaaten zy, getuigen niet alleen Henricus Altingius (In Historia de Ecclesiis Palatinis Cap. XLIV., p. 83,) en Joh. Ludovicus Fabricus, (In Opusculis, p. 414,) maar ook de andere, in dezelfde plaatze terstond daarop gevolgde, *Uitgaave*, op welke laatste Bladzyde bekend gemaakt word, dat men 't geen in den eersten Druk, voornaamelyk *Bladzyde* 55, voorby gezien was, in deezen Druk, op Keurvorstelyk Bevel, verbeterd en 'er by gevoegd hebbe (Zie von deeze Uitgaave, en de daarin gebruikte woorden, hier boven Bladz., 275,) Wanneer men nu de gemelde Bladzyd naaziet, vind men daar de *tachtigste vraag*, die van het Avondmaal des Heeren en van de Paapsche Misse handelt. *Koecher*, pp. 280–281.

† Koecher, p. 281.

Low Dutch translation of the Heidelberg Catechism of the year 1567, in which the closing part of the question in hand is expressed in the words retained in all future editions, and which are the same as we now have it.

It was soon found to be inconvenient to have the questions and answers follow one another without being numbered. This was changed in a fourth edition, published at Heidelberg, 1573,* in which the questions are numbered. In this edition, the now common division of the catechism into Lord's Days is also found.

The most valuable of the early editions was that published in Neustadt. Its title, giving a full view of its contents, was thus: Catechismus; or Short Instruction in Christian Doctrine, together with the Church Ceremonies, Prayers, and very complete Proofs from the Holy Scriptures. Item, the reply of the Theologians of the University of Heidelberg to the unfounded accusations and perversions of it, and of the Scripture passages with which it is confirmed, by several persons in an improper manner. Item, D. Martin Luther's View of the breaking of Bread in the Holy Supper. Item, Answers, and opposing questions, to six questions concerning the Holy Supper, in regard to which the Evangelical Churches agree or differ in the matter of the Lord's Supper, by D. Zacharias Ursinus. Neustadt at the Hardt." On the last page there is added: "Printed at Neustadt on the Hardt, MDXCV." "This," says Van Alpen, "is the most valuable of all editions; the apologies which it contains being masterly productions."

The peaceful spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism is universally admitted and admired; yet this did not save it from becoming the occasion of strife immediately on its publication. The war, however, came not from it, but

* E. W. Kramer, in his translation of Koecher's work into Dutch, expresses the opinion that this is an error of the printer, and that it should be 1563. "For," he adds, "the learned Prof. J. Ens, in his '*Short Historical accounts of the Public Writings*, p. 55, clearly says that this had already been done in the autumn of 1563, on the occasion when Prince Frederick published a Church Agenda for his dominions, to which the Heidelberg Catechism was appended, which was thus the third edition issued in the same year, 1563." *Koecher*, p. 280.

but from the warlike spirits of those whose favor it did not secure. When Elijah was accused by the degenerate Ahab of troubling Israel, he denied the charge, declaring that the cause of trouble was to be found in the spirit of Ahab himself, and in that of his father's house. Christ himself, who came as the Prince of Peace, became the occasion of those joined by the most intimate natural ties being set at variance with one another. John, the most lovely and peaceful of the Apostles, was hated and persecuted like the rest. "For my love they are my adversaries." Thus it was with the peaceful catechism. "Its very moderation seemed to magnify the front of its offence. Had there been more of the lion or tiger in its mien, and less of the lamb, its presence might have proved possibly less irritating to the polemical humor of the times. As it was, there was felt to be provocation in its very meekness. Its outward carriage was held to be deceitful and treacherous; and its heresy was counted all the worse for being hard to find, and shy of the light. The winds of strife were let loose upon it accordingly from all points of the compass."*

Princes and theologians set themselves against it. Matthias Flacius Illyricus, a man whose pugnacious spirit equalled that of the notorious Hesshuss, but whose learning was vastly more respectable, in 1563 published the "Refutation of the Calvanistic Catechism of Olevianus." Prominent among its earliest Lutheran assailants was Tilemann Hesshuss, the bitter enemy of Zwinglians and Calvinists, whose fanatic zeal had much to do with producing and hastening the occasion which called it forth. His "True Warning" against the Heidelberg Catechism, Erfurt, 1588, was, however, not honored with an answer. From the side of Rome it was attacked with equal fierceness, and by a greater number of controversialists.

Whilst theologians, Lutheran and Roman Catholic, saw in it heresy, princes regarded its influence as a dangerous element in the politics of the times. Prince Wolfgang, of Neuberg, and Margrave Charles, of Baden, both wrote to

* History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism, by J. W. Nevin, D. D., 1847, p. 60.

Frederick protesting against his unorthodox proceedings in introducing his catechism. Even his intimate friend, Christopher, Duke of Wirtemberg, was alarmed, and insisted upon a conference and debate to be held between the theologians of the Palatinate and Wirtemberg, with a view of settling the trouble. This disputation, lasting from the 10th to the 13th of April, 1564, was held in the convent of Maulbron, in the presence of the Princes, Frederick and Christopher. On this occasion, the catechism was nobly defended by Bocquin, Olevianus and Ursinus; though nothing satisfactory to the opposing party resulted from the conference. On the contrary, it was followed by many controversial pamphlets, and increased strife and trouble.

The three Princes just mentioned, now united in a lengthy writing to Frederick, in which they gave their views of the published catechism, expressing their deep regret that he publicly adopted the views of Zurich and Calvin, adding, also, a list of specifications, in which they sharply deal with the supposed faults of the catechism. The Prince sent this writing to the celebrated Swiss theologian, Henry Bullinger, asking him to answer it, which he did, in a very able manner defending the catechism.

A greater trouble came—an event fraught with great peril to the catechism, and with it, to the Reformed Church. The question began to be canvassed, whether the Palatinate, in these circumstances, "could remain politically included in the terms of the Religious Peace, by which, in the year 1555, the free exercise of their religion was secured to the Protestants in Germany, against the authority previously claimed over them by the Church of Rome. The protection of the empire had been pledged in this case only to those who followed the confession of Augsburg. Must not the Elector Frederick then be held to have forfeited, by his present position, all right and title to be reckoned in this connection? Could he be allowed to claim in future the privileges which it secured?"*

* Dr. Nevin's History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism.

This must be tested. In May, 1566, the celebrated Imperial Diet was held at Augsburg. The bishops along the Rhine, and the chapters of the convents, brought in their complaints to the Emperor, and many Protestant Princes united themselves against Frederick III. The newly planted Reformed Church, with its catechism, was in danger of being suppressed. The whole assembly stood opposed to the Reformed Prince, and was bent on calling him to a strict reckoning on account of the catechism which he had introduced. The Emperor and the nobility insisted that the catechism should be rejected and prohibited; and it was even proposed that the Elector himself should be excluded from the union of the Imperial States—yea, that he should be deposed from the Electorate—some even spoke of punishment by death! It was a true crisis. On the results of that hour, so far as human eye could see, hung the question whether the Heidelberg Catechism should live or die, and whether the Reformed Church should or should not exist in the future—or maintain, at least, its existence on fields of blood!

His brother, Prince Richard, of Simmern, had earnestly warned him not to attend the Diet. In two touching letters still extant, he admitted the danger to which he should expose himself by going to the Augsburg Diet. In these letters he calls to mind the strong faith of his illustrious relative, Duke John Frederick, Elector of Saxony:† "I know that the same God who then kept him in the right and true knowledge of his Gospel, still lives, and is mighty also to keep me, a poor and simple man, and will certainly keep me by His holy Spirit, even though matters should proceed so far as to cost blood; which, if it should please my Father in heaven to bring me to such honor, I could never sufficiently praise Him for it, either here in time, or yonder in eternity."

With such confidence in God, he went firmly to the Di-

† He had been defeated and taken prisoner by the Emperor Charles V., in the memorable battle of Mueiberg, April 24, 1547. He was condemned to death, and afterwards pardoned again; but robbed of his Electoral dignity, he remained for five years a captive in the Emperor's camp. *Dr. Nevin's History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism*, p. 64.

et at Augsburg, in May, 1566; and, followed by his son John Casimer, who, as his "spiritual armor-bearer," carried the Bible and the Augsburg Confession after him, he appeared in the assembly of the Princes, to defend himself, his catechism, and his doings.

After the charges against him had all been presented, he withdrew for a quarter of an hour, and then returned with his defence. What words are here! What sentiments to fall from the lips of a Prince! What is here produced in fifteen minutes reflects more true glory on the name of the Elector, than most Princes acquire from the achievements of a lifetime. Amid all the glittering crowns that dazzle around him, he sees "none but Jesus;" acknowledges only his power; seeks only His glory. Hear his words, and let none of them be lost: "Although I have hitherto not been able to come to a perfectly clear understanding of the precise points in regard to which charges have been presented against me, and requisitions made, yet so much I promise myself from the reasonableness of His Imperial Majesty, that he will not commence the process by executing the sentence, but that he will graciously hear and weigh the defence I shall make; which, if it were required, I would be ready to make, undaunted, in the midst of the market-place, in this town. So far as matters of a religious nature are involved, I confess freely that, in those things which concern the conscience, I acknowledge as Master only Him who is Lord of lords and King of kings. For the question here is not in regard to a cap of flesh (*cappa carnis*), but it pertains to the soul and its salvation, for which I am indebted alone to my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and which, as His gift, I will sacredly preserve. Therefore, I cannot grant your venerable Imperial Majesty the right of standing in the place of my God and Saviour.

"What men understand by Calvinism, I do not know: this I can say, with a pure conscience, that I have never read Calvin's writings. But the agreement of Frankfurt, and the Augsburg Confession, I signed at Raumburg, together with the other Princes, of whom the majority are

here present. In this faith I continue firmly, on no other ground than because I find it established in the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Nor do I believe that any one can successfully show, that I have done or received anything that stands opposed to that formulary. *But that my catechism, word for word, is drawn, not from human but from divine sources, the references that stand in the margin will show. For this reason, also, certain theologians have in vain wearied themselves in attacking it, since it has been shown them, by the open Scriptures, how baseless is their opposition.* What I have elsewhere publicly declared to your Imperial Majesty, in a full assembly of the Princes, namely, that, if any one, of whatever age, station, or class he may be, even the humblest, can teach me something better from the Holy Scriptures, I will thank him from the bottom of my heart, and readily be obedient to the divine truth: that I repeat now, in the presence of this assembly of the whole empire. If there be any one here, among my lords and friends, who will undertake it, I am prepared to hear him, and here are the Holy Scriptures at hand. Should it please your Imperial Majesty to undertake this task, I would regard it as the greatest favor, and acknowledge it with suitable gratitude. With this, my explanation, I hope your Imperial Majesty will be satisfied, even as also your Imperial Majesty's father, the Emperor Ferdinand, of blessed memory, was not willing to do violence to my conscience however pleasant it would have been to him, had I consented to attend the Popish mass at the imperial coronation, at Frankfurt. Should, contrary to my expectations, my defence, and the Christian and reasonable conditions which I have proposed, not be regarded of any account, I shall comfort myself in this, that my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ has promised to me, and to all who believe, that whatsoever we lose on earth for His name's sake, we shall receive an hundred-fold in the life to come."

These words of the Elector made a very favorable impression. All gazed with wonder at the great-hearted Prince. Only one of the bishops murmured something to

himself about the mass, which is so sharply rejected in the 80th question of the catechism. Prince Augustus of Saxony said, that there had been too much hasty action in this matter; and, approaching Frederick, he tapped him softly upon the shoulder, and said: "FRITZ, THOU ART MORE PIOUS THAN ALL OF US PUT TOGETHER!" The Margrave of Baden, at the close of the assembly, expressed himself in the same manner, saying: "Why do you attack this Prince? he is more pious than us all."

Frederick was now left unmolested. Five days later the Princes handed in to the Emperor this public declaration: "That the Elector has, it is true, a different view of the Holy Supper from the Augsburg Confession, but, in regard to justification, and in most other points, he agrees with it; and further, that they are not willing to exclude Frederick or any one else, in or outside of Germany, from the religious peace." The Elector, after the Emperor had graciously taken leave of him, returned in peace and safety to his beloved Heidelberg, on the Friday before Whitsuntide. "On the evening before the sacred festival, being present at the preparation for the communion, in the Church of the Holy Ghost, he grasped Olevianus by the hand in the presence of the whole congregation, and exhorted him to continue steadfast in the faith. It was an affecting and impressive spectacle! The next day, he partook of the Sacrament, in company with his son Casimer and the whole court."*

Thus by wisdom and firmness did the excellent Prince avert the threatening disaster. By a spirit as mild and pacific, and yet as positive, as that of the catechism itself, "he stopped the mouth of lions, quenched the violence of fire, and turned to flight the armies of the aliens," and saved from proscription that precious symbol of faith, from which millions have since learned what is their only comfort in life and in death. It was then, as it has been since, and is now, only loved the more for the dangers it had passed.

Lancaster, Pa. H. H.

* Dr. Nevin's History and Genius of the Heidelberg Catechism, p. 64.

ART. III.—THE HUMAN BODY AND DISEASE, CONSIDERED FROM THE CHRISTIAN STAND-POINT. *

The Hebrew sage, after having mastered all the knowledge of his time, and learned that there was nothing new under the sun, commenced his sententious proverbs with the grand declaration, that "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." How great the contrast between this devout declaration of a pious heart, and the godless assertions of those, who cultivate the paths of science without an humble recognition of their own nothingness as compared with the almighty Lord and Creator of heaven and earth! How barren and meaningless all the charms, which the mere worldling extracts from the fair fields of science, illumined by cold and cheerless light, as compared with those which meet the gaze of the Christian philosopher, whose vision has been cleared and brightened by his appropriation of the high and ennobling doctrines of his faith! The same objects—but how different the effects produced on the minds and souls of the two observers! One views them as the productions of an inconceivable Omnipotence, preserved by the agency of laws, which an incomprehensible Omnipresence is ever directing and upholding, and which are the wondrous manifestations of a mighty Omniscience. He is a stranger in a strange land. However much science may aid him to understand the phenomenal scenes which bewilder with their beauty and charm his senses—however much he may endeavor to exhibit, in words, the living attractions which all these possess, and

* *What Christianity teaches respecting the Body.* A sermon preached in the Parish Church, Crathie, 11th October, 1857. By Robert Lee, D. D. Regius Professor of Biblical Criticism and Biblical Antiquities in the University of Edinburgh. Edinburgh: Cowan & Co., 1857. pp. 31.

God in Disease, or the Manifestations of Design in Morbid Phenomena. By James F. Duncan, M. D., Physician to Sir P. Dunn's Hospital, Dublin. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1852. pp. 232.

with the aid of "the articulate voice of poetry," so well styled "the nearest approach of the human faculties to raptures more than human," his efforts only show too plainly, that he has failed to catch the significance of nature—he has failed to recognize the life which gives it all its meaning, and has contented himself with stringing dead bones artistically together; satisfied with a contemplation of the anatomy of nature, has overlooked the active current of vitality, which a knowledge of its physiology would teach him is wisely permeating every portion of creation.

The other, although not possessed of a tithe of the scientific knowledge which the mere savan claims, yet feels that all nature, whether it be inanimate or animate, the insensate clod and the bright flower, the rugged mountain and the goat browsing on the crags, the dark storm-cloud, with lurid flashes of lightning, and the drapery of Tyrian purple, of gold and splendent silver which bedeck the western horizon as the sun slowly sinks from our gaze, the worm that crawls and the being of beauty, whose flashing eye, sweet smiles and gentle manners collect tributes from scores of devoted admirers—all these are but the works of a Father's hand. Filial affection for that Father in heaven, invests all His works with an interest that makes them dear to His child, who now feels that *these* are his birthright, that the earth on which he lives, with its phenomena, its secret and open wonders, was made for him, and that the same Almighty power that brought it into being, is exercising over it, through every second of its existence, a watchful care and supervision. For such an one, no cloud obscures his vision. The whole heavens are irradiant with light, that penetrates caverns, otherwise dark, illumines deep vallies, and bedecks with rainbow tints the rugged sides of the mountain. He has learned, that "wisdom is the principal thing," and that he is truly wise who fears God and keeps his commandments.

This contrast has been marked from the earliest beginnings of mere human science! Satisfied with a study of "*the things that are seen,*" those which are unseen and eter-

nal in their very nature, were neglected, or rushing to the other extreme, with a kindred blindness, and despising the material things of this world, a special devotion to matters pertaining to the soul and eternity was affected. In this way, two schools of philosophers, and two schools of religionists arose, and have perpetuated themselves even down to our time, despite the instructions which the revealed Word and the Church have imparted to mankind. The connecting link between the two is beyond the reach of the mere man of the world, and he will be found either deifying the material creation and worshipping its laws, or forming to himself some ideal which will claim his constant devotion. The vibration is between the two extremes, either materialism or spiritualism—the former doing violence to the spirit, and the latter, to the matter which it vivifies and quickens into life.

In the religion of the ancients, both extremes may be found. One sect would worship material substances; the other, believing God to be an eternal essence, rejected all material representations, and hoped by means of a blind faith to be brought into the presence of Him whom no man had ever seen. One rejected the spirit; the other rejected the only mode through which we could see clearly the power and efficacy of that spirit, and recognize it by our earthly senses. Need we say that the first was *wrong, radically wrong.* Such an assertion will meet an approval from every one in this Christian nation; but we must go farther, and learn to know that the second was also wrong, and in many points fully as erroneous as the first. To the mortal being is denied any but a vague conception of the spiritual, unless he can rise to it from something material which it has once enlivened, and thus the material becomes as it were the first stepping stone to a knowledge of the spiritual. When the latter, however, is once gained, then it brings all aid to the more perfect understanding of the former, and the two are thus found essential to each other. We rise in the consideration of nature's phenomena to such inductions as set forth its laws, and these, if correct, make

those more intelligible and clear to the human mind. They are classified and arranged, made to assume some real relation to the general ideas which they embody in a sensuous form, and mere human knowledge in this way becomes human wisdom.

It is true, that when we endeavor to form an idea of the existence of God, confining ourselves strictly to the region of Natural Theology, we find that all our deductions from effect to cause never lead to such an idea. But still, all over the face of our globe, wherever man lives and thinks, there is a recognition of the necessity of such an existence, of the existence of an Eternal Creator of all things, by whose fiat the heavens and the earth were made. And this idea comes not to us by reason, but exists in our minds, deeply and immovably fixed, as a part of their own original structure. It is one of those innate ideas which education can no more give than it can totally eradicate. As Brahma, Jupiter, Zeus, Gitche-Manito, or Jehovah, it is in every breast. The soul falls down and worships, from the very necessity of its existence, something higher, holier and greater than itself. This worship may blindly endeavor to exhibit to the senses, a representation of the form its imagination or fancy has declared the Supreme Being should possess, and, when left to itself, the representation will remain mean, low and material—yet the recognition of the spiritual is necessary. But with the pagan, all this is blind. He feels that his material representations are, after all that he may do to embellish them, but inanimate or soulless structures, which are infinitely inferior in perfection to his own human body. Driven almost to despair, he pictures ever to his mind God as a great Creator and a great Destroyer—One in whose presence he can never come with an assurance that He will graciously listen to his complaints, or extend a father's kindly hand. Feeling that the highest object on earth he can respect is his fellow-man, he invests his God with a human form, and by exalting the faculties of the human being to a species of perfection, falls down and worships heroes and demi-gods. This is the

highest form that worship can assume with the non-Christian soul.

With the Christian, however, this idea assumes a clearness that makes it satisfy the wants of the soul, and yet is divested of that which is terrifying or appalling. He learns to know the Almighty Maker, of whom an innate idea exists in his mind, through His Son, who assumed a *human* form, took upon Himself the nature of man, and then, as *the perfect man*, sympathizing with all human griefs and woes, feeling the tender ties which bind the son to the mother's heart, enduring contumely and scorn—living, breathing, suffering and enduring as all men must do, finally, after a most unjust persecution and series of cruel sufferings, met an ignominious death upon the cross. This simple tale told of a man opens up the sympathies of the human soul. It feels that, while all this has occurred with a man, yet there must have been conjoined with *His* human nature something greater than human nature, under any other circumstances, could have exhibited. Now the God-like shows itself. At length man can learn to know his God. And when faith seizes hold of the idea of the incarnation, sympathies are converted into adoration, love and worship become so intermingled that they are inseparable. God is recognized as *our* Father, because His well-beloved Son had assumed in the course of time the form and attributes of a brother, and we hail him as our elder brother for all eternity. Then, by the aid of faith and the light which the Holy Spirit brings to us, we learn to appreciate still more that material form, that personality which first attracted our attention, and whose charms wooed us to a knowledge of the holy and the divine. Thus the Christian can sing with one of his own poets—

> "Till God in *human flesh* I see,
> My thoughts no comfort find;
> The holy, just and sacred Three,
> Are terrors to my mind."

If, then, the humanity of Christ proves attractive to the wandering soul, and from this it rises to higher and fuller conceptions of the nature of the Trinity, it must needs be

that the human form, which was thus sanctified by being made the dwelling place of God, is entitled to our respect —that no true Christian can treat his body as an encumbrance to his soul, which it were well to be rid of, without doing injury to one portion of his human nature. It follows, that that which Christ thought it not unworthy Him to assume, should not be a hindrance to the Christian's soul on earth, but should be made to co-operate in the great end and aim of life, viz: the glorifying of God.

We propose directing attention to the teachings of Christianity as to the human body and its diseases. The subject is one which an enlightened Christian mind will find is not sufficiently understood, and that some of our Churches have so far failed to appreciate it, that a disrespect of the wants of the body has been considered tantamount to a high exaltation of spiritual life, while others have looked upon every disease as an indication of a direct visitation of God for some violation of His holy law. We trust that both these views will be seen to be erroneous before the subject is dismissed.

That the soul is clogged, in its aspirations after a holier state of being, by the wants of the body, seems to be an error woven into the very substance of the religion of the day. From the pulpit we are taught that the body must be despised, that the day of death will be a day of joy simply because we shall be freed from pain and sickness in losing our bodies, and that the Christian becomes more and more fitted for heaven, in proportion as he spurns those nice attentions to his body, which physiology teaches him are requisite to keep it in perfect condition. Still further, the religious devotee, relying upon works, and not upon faith, which shows itself *through* works, bewilders himself into the notion that the more privations undergone on earth, the more pain and suffering experienced, the more sure his passage from a world of trouble to one of bliss. As the Hindoo devotee, he assumes that by forcing his body into unnatural positions and retaining it in such for months and years, by lacerating his body with knives and

burning it with fire, by undertaking long and painful pilgrimages to the shrine of Juggernaut, he will purify his soul from the pollution of this world, and fit it for a blissful hereafter. Should death befall him on his toilsome pilgrimage (and millions have thus perished), it is hailed as a happy boon. Or if, perchance, the Car of Juggernaut roll its huge weight along, joyously he throws himself under its wheels, and, by a horrid end, hopes to gain celestial glory. As the widow, the funeral pyre of the dead husband is mounted, and, amid the blaze of the burning wood, life is lost with the hope of endless joy to the spirit. Again, as the crusader, under the maddening watch-cry of "God and my Lady," unknown lands are crossed, perils encountered which appal our minds even at their very recital, and death is hailed with joy as the brave man's sure admission into the courts of heaven. Infatuated with the same blind zeal, the ascetic undergoes days and nights of continuous fasting, exposes his body to stripes, deprives it of the comforts which sound health requires, and thus endeavors to purify his soul from contamination with the world.

We do not desire to overlook the real bravery which underlies all these self-inflicted tortures, nor would we in any way contribute to a cowardly fear of bodily suffering that would prevent men from encountering any peril that the cause of religion or humanity should throw in their way. Rather would we employ the words of Kingsley,* and sound them aloud even in trumpet tones, that "he who willingly throws away his life for the cause of mankind, which is the cause of God, the Father of mankind, shall save it, and be rewarded a hundred-fold. He who renders up his animal life as a worthless thing, in the cause of duty, commits his real and human life, his very soul and self, into the hands of a just and merciful Father, who has promised to leave no good deed unrewarded." It is not a question whether a man should encounter peril, when duty calls him to the task. The question is, should he seek to mortify his body, when no such call is made, with the vain hope of thereby doing good to his soul.

* Lectures on Alexandria.

1. The human body must be respected by us, because it was selected, of all created forms, as the particular one which the divine nature entered into and assumed. Christ Jesus, the Son of the living God, "begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God—of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made *man.*" Or, as we find the same idea expressed in the glorious old Te-Deum: Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem, non horruisti Virginis uterum. And what is included in the idea of man? Dare we think of it as a mere spirit unclothed with material form? Can we picture to ourselves the loved ones who are no longer with us on earth, in our waking visions or nightly dreams, in any other way but as occupying *human* bodies? Does the mother, whose babe has been removed from the troubles of a sinful world, and carried by the loving arms of angels to that home where her hopes and faith induce her to believe she will again meet her never more to be separated—does she invest her with any other but the loved form? Does the husband picture to himself, as he notes the passage of the weary hours, brooding in melancholy sadness over the object of his heart's inmost affection, lost now to him for this life—in any other but that quiet, matronly form and loving face which had become a part of himself? No! No!! We all firmly hope—for we have all had our heart-strings vibrating in unison with sadness at the removal from our sides of some quiet, gentle spirit, or some great, loving soul—to meet those, who have left us on earth, where partings shall be no more, and where mutual recognitions shall be granted us.

"The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." Soul and body are necessary to the idea of humanity, and the fallen condition equally affects both. While the one, left to a state of nature, is directing her way towards the gates of perdition, the sen-

tence passed on the other was, "Cursed is the ground for thy sake; in sorrow shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life." The object of the incarnation was to sanctify both soul and body; hence we say that Christ assumed the human body when he became man. In this view, our bodies command higher respect than when viewed as mere organisms, involving both mechanical and vital operations. A species of awe fills one's soul as he thinks that the same form, which he wears, was once worn by the Deity himself, and that thus we have become, potentially, of the same family, and, if we only will, that our elder brother will prepare for us a mansion at his Father's.

The intimate relation of Christ to his Church is frequently likened to that of the soul with the body—"for we are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." And St. Paul distinctly sets forth his belief in the sanctification of this body when, writing to the Thessalonians, he prays that "the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul and *body*, be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."—1 Thess., v. 23.

2. We are specially enjoined, "by the mercies of God, to present our bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is our reasonable service." This passage, together with another from the Epistle to the Corinthians —"glorify God in your body," has doubtless been warped from its true meaning by those who believe in the value and efficacy of self-inflicted tortures. "The glorifying of God" and "the living sacrifice" are not accomplished by such means, but by a consecration of our bodies to the good, and an avoidance of those sins which the allurements of the world, the flesh and the devil would lead us to commit. The sacrifice is not to be a dead, but a living sacrifice, which can alone be acceptable unto God. Hence, if we maim our bodies, injure any of our limbs, or in any way do them harm, we prevent to that extent the presentation of this sacrifice. The student who, from mistaken notions of zeal in his calling, deprives nature of her *proper* amount

of rest, the cloistered devotee who brings on disease and suffering by a neglect of the ordinary rules of health—the minister who permits *animal excitement* so far to influence him in his calling as to transcend the rules of health; these are all not presenting their bodies as living sacrifices, but are acting criminally in inducing disease by setting at defiance known laws, and thus unfitting themselves for carrying out the duties which Providence has assigned them.

3. The body is called "the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own. For ye are bought with a price; therefore glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are God's." In one point of view, this passage of Holy Writ is calculated to produce great awe to the Christian's mind, for it is especially directed to him. That the Third Person of the Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, should deign to employ our frail and sinful bodies as a place in which He should dwell, is so wonderful an act of condescension, and yet involves such terrible responsibility, that one may well tremble lest he fail to keep that temple pure and free from contamination with the gross lusts of the flesh. But then the comforting thought comes to the mind, that He is "the Lord, the Giver of life," and it is through His agency we are enabled so to conduct ourselves, as members of Christ's mystical body, that His Father shall be our Father, and that He is the comforter that Christ sent from heaven for the suffering and weak members of His Church on earth. It is said that the father of Origen, kissed reverently his infant son when sleeping, as though he felt the necessity of paying homage to the human personality which was enclosed in his little form. But when we think of the indwelling of the God-head in the baptized child, that it has been accepted by Christ, through His minister, as a member of His own body, dare we look upon it, however humble its position may be in life, as any thing but one of the noblest and grandest things on the earth? Laws of human origin give man the right of resenting any bodily injury, even to the taking of life of the offending party.

We can see how these are based upon right, as the nature of such an injury involves an insult offered to a temple of the most High—a consecrated place, wherein God Himself delights to dwell. Not wishing to justify the rash use of such a law, yet it is clear to our minds, that one of the grossest insults that man can offer to his fellow-man, is that which involves ignominious treatment of his body. That returning evil for evil is not laid down in the code of morals which flows from the relation of the Christian to the Saviour, is manifest from Christ's own words, that good should be returned for evil, and that when smitten on one cheek the other should rather be turned to the smiter than retaliation should be employed, and also, from His own example, during the whole train of events which filled the days of His trial, sufferings and death.

If the body be the temple of the Holy Ghost, does not this fact tend to ameliorate the condition of the poor, the enslaved and the oppresed? The relations which existed at the time of Christ were not destroyed in order to allow the reception of the new Dispensation. A life was given to the world which was intended to penetrate all classes and conditions of society. No laws or commands were laid down declaring one form or other of government the correct one, but the disciples were taught to reverence Cæsar, to respect the powers that be, with the certain result that all forms of oppression would *lose* their oppressive character under the genial influence of Christianity, and would exist then but as forms. It is well to keep this in mind, when a willful and rebellious spirit urges us on to an overthrowal of authority. It is better to bear "hoping all things," than to act on the impulses of our own proud wills and cast off proper allegiance. He that hath Christ in him, and recognizes the bodies of his brethren as being the temples of the Holy Ghost, will treat them with Christian kindness, whether they be known as subjects, slaves or brethren; and he that hath not this life in him, will maltreat even his equals in the world's scale of rank. The former has the highest authority and influence to induce him to be kind and considerate, the lat-

ter has nothing but his reputation in the world to regulate his conduct. It is easy to see which one can be trusted—on which we can rely in the time of necessity.

4. The next consideration that we shall adduce as demanding from us respect for the human body, is the fact that there will be a *Resurrection of the Body.* The doctrine of the resurrection, as set forth by Paul, is based upon the fact of the resurrection of the Saviour, and it is explicitly stated, that "if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen." Upon the fact that the God-man had overcome the power of death, and had set aside the punishment which sin had attached to the human race, the doctrine can rest securely. The soul and body shall be reunited—the latter no longer a fleshly body, but a spiritual body, freed from all the imperfections inherent to animal life here, and invested with glorious attributes. Here is not the place to dwell upon the proof that such a resurrection of the body must take place. We receive it, as all the other articles of the Apostles' Creed, on faith—an object, not of argumentation, but of belief—a truth which flows necessarily from one's belief in the Humanity of Christ, and is inseparably connected with the same.

In *these* bodies shall we be assembled together at the resurrection-morn. The thought is overpowering! We eat and drink, and in a thousand ways indulge in lawful and unlawful pleasures, sacrifice comfort and ease for the gratification of the "lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes and the pride of life," make our vital functions contend with countless difficulties which a decent respect to them should induce us to avoid, and thus make our animal life altogether abnormal and artificial, instead of normal and natural. All this is done in a body, which is not destined, in its true nature, to perish, but which shall be raised from the dead, and live throughout the countless ages of eternity. Let us be understood. We do not wish to convey the idea that the fleshly particles, which Chemistry informs us make up the structure of our organisms, should be raised up from the grave exactly as they were at the moment of

death, invested with the law of decay and constant change. It would be degrading to the idea of the resurrection to suppose, that the albumen, fibrin, nervous and osseous structures, the blood and the changing secretions and excretions should necessarily exist in the body at the time of the occurrence of this grand phenomenon, as they now appear. But whatever now constitutes human identity, whatever causes us to remain the same amid the constantly recurring changes which perishable matter undergo, *this* will rise and form the spiritual body, which shall thenceforward live in happiness or perdition. What it may be, is a mystery, and cannot be fathomed by human knowledge.

The separation of the vital spark from the body, leaving it for the moment with its natural expression—that by which we knew it best, is not eternal. No! We know that all is not lost, although we may sympathise with the wondrous truths embodied in those beautiful lines of the poet:

> "He who hath bent him o'er the dead,
> Ere the first day of death has fled,
> The first dark day of nothingness,
> The last of danger and distress,
> (Before decay's effacing fingers
> Have swept the lines where beauty lingers),
> And mark'd the mild angelic air,
> The rapture of repose that's there,
> The fix'd yet tender traits that streak
> The languor of the placid cheek,
> And—but for that sad, shrouded eye,
> That fires not, wins not, weeps not, now,
> And but for that chill, changeless brow,
> Where cold obstruction's apathy
> Appals the gazing mourner's heart,
> As if to him it could impart
> The doom he dreads yet dwells upon;
> Yes, but for these, and these alone,
> Some moments—aye, one treacherous hour,
> He still might doubt the tyrant's power;
> So fair, so calm, so softly sealed,
> The first, last look by death revealed."

Paul expresses the idea of the resurrection and the Christian's hope hereafter, when he says, that "we that are in

this tabernacle do groan, being burdened; not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon, that mortality might be swallowed up of life." With such a grand birthright, the human body demands our respect. We dare not treat it as the beast that perisheth. There is an eternal future for it. The microcosom that is before us is destined to survive all the changes which seem now so wholly to control it. Gaze at it in whatever form we please—as innocent childhood, with its lively prattle about joys and pleasures that we consider trifling and of no importance; as man, exulting in his strength and fearlessly compelling nature's agency to the performance of his own behests; as meek, lovely woman, going about and doing good, bringing peace and content to the troubled soul, comfort and relief to the suffering body; as weak, tottering age, "the poor, infirm, weak and despised old man," dependent, even as in childhood's days, upon the ministrations of others, hoping for the hour when his release from sufferings shall be announced; in health or in sickness; doing good to his fellow-men or violating laws both human and divine, the human body must be treated with respect, punished or rewarded in accordance with just laws; for its existence is not for the moment, but for the ages which in a ceaseless succession shall follow each other, with an unerring course and precision, throughout an immeasurable and inconceivable eternity.

All that we have heretofore said involves necessarily the duty of guarding with great care the health of the body. Indeed, in one point of view, this is as necessary as the health of the soul. The two are singularly connected together. The happy contented soul acts upon the material frame which it inhabits, and stamps its mark on the countenance, while the filthy and degraded body reacts upon the soul, and imparts to it a low and grovelling tendency. Even a superficial glance at this relation of soul to body, will justify us in asserting as another argument obtained from the Christian stand-point:

5. That *physical* health is more or less necessary to the

perfect health of the soul of man, and that his spiritual faculties thrive *best* when his body is not exposed to pinching penury and want. Says Dr. Lee, to whose sermon on this subject we acknowledge ourselves largely indebted, "certain states of the body undeniably occasion, irritate and inflame those appetites and inclinations, which it is one great end of Christianity to repress or regulate. It is known how much our blessed Saviour insists upon meekness, long-suffering, gentleness, patience and the like. * * * But these graces, which are so difficult in even the best condition of our corrupt nature, are rendered almost impossible by certain states of the nervous system. Sad experience has caused some to know, how dire a struggle the spirit is sometimes called to maintain against the flesh; and that it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a dyspeptic person to be gentle, meek, patient, long-suffering."

The laws of hygeine, when neglected, revenge themselves not only on the body, but on the mind and soul. Much of the brooding melancholy, the fashionable disease, "Vapors" or "Blues," the sickly lackadaisical sentimentality of very young and very silly lads and lassies, the petulant and irritable tempers of men and women—much of all this is the direct consequence of an open violation of the laws of health. The body has revenged itself on the mind and the soul. If these will not respect the laws of its being, it will overthrow their equilibrium, and leave them to torments akin to those it is suffering. And the effect pervades every act they are called upon to perform, whether religious or secular. The clergyman who relies upon extempore inspiration in the delivery of his sermon, or who eschews liturgical forms for public worship, and prides himself upon the offering up of impressive prayers, instead of acting as the mouth-piece for his people in their confessions, thanksgivings, petitions and intercessions, should, above all others, feel himself bound to pay the most rigid attention to the laws of health, lest a morbid condition of body should react on his mind, and his people be made to suffer, with

fatigue and weariness of spirit, on account of his bodily infirmities. Many a sermon, breathing the threatenings of the law instead of the gentle pleadings of the gospel, has been occasioned by a fit of indigestion, which soured the speaker at the whole world around him. Many a tirade of condemnation of his fellow-Christians has been the result of a surfeit at the table. The law of charity has been violated over and over again by those, whose Christian character would have never justified such a violation, had their whole being not been shaken, by an open and senseless following of habits which have overthrown their bodily health.

There was a deal of good philosophy in the words which Shakspeare puts in Cæsar's mouth, when he wishes to have himself surrounded with

"Sleek-headed men, and such as sleep o' nights."

The loss of rest, in consequence of the excesses of the day, also acts powerfully on the spirits of man, and his religious experience is often shaded by dark, lowering clouds, produced from such causes. We have not the space, but the subject is worth examination, as to the fanatical sects and orders which have really originated from diseased bodies acting on the minds of their originators. It would be curious to investigate the condition of the digestive organs of those, who, with childish fretfulness, have thrown aside all Church authority, and have rushed, with an insane zeal, into the extravagances to which an unbridled private judgment has led them. How much that the world has been accustomed to consider as the result of sound conviction and unwavering assurance, would soon reveal itself as the silly whim of a morbid constitution?

Indeed, nothing can be more certain than, that many a Christian is heaping up for himself life-long pain and sorrow by his carelessness as to the wants of the body; and while dark, brooding clouds are hanging over his soul, preventing those outshinings of happiness and content which are so peculiarly his right, he is but reaping the inevitable results of a violation of nature's laws. The *sana mens in corpore sano* was the object of the prayer of the heathen

writer, and it is a crying shame that the Christian should not know that this *sana mens* can never be fully attained under any other condition. The wild dreams of the ascetic, and his cruel self-torturings, together with the inhuman shouts and ear-piercing shrieks of the fanatic, are all indications of morbid mental faculties, too often occasioned by violations of the laws that the God of nature had ordained as essential to the normal state of their bodies.

A healthy condition of the body enables us the better to perform the duties which are incumbent on us, during our residence on earth. These fall naturally under the three heads of duty to God, to fellow-man and to self. A slight glance at the relation a healthy body bears towards the performance of these duties, is all that can be allowed us at present.

We have already shown how man's religious condition may be affected by a morbid condition of the body, and it is easy to perceive, that all this must seriously affect his relations to the Deity. The command to love the Lord, involves not only all the heart and soul, but also all "our might." What if we have made our might weakness by our own misconduct or carelessness, is not this a sin against the command? We must "glorify God in our body," and this is not and cannot be done, if we pursue a course of conduct which will deprive the body of any of its strength, or impair the vigor of any of the vital functions.

Our relations to our fellow-men are briefly set forth in the Saviour's second commandment: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Love—what is not embraced in that comprehensive word! The greatest of all the Christian graces, it blooms in the barren plains and all around becomes irradiant with its rainbow hues, and is redolent with the perfume of happiness and holy content! It dwells in the humble cot, and poverty is no longer a privation and hardship, but the bright beams of another world gild all that is rude and misshapen with the gold of heaven. It brings relief to the sorrowing and heart-sticken, whispers consolation in the mourner's ear, seeks the poor, the blind,

the halt, and cheers them up amid life's devious paths, tends by the bedside of the dying, and smooths the pillow on which the head of the sufferer, in the anguish of death, is resting; braves the dangers of the battle-field to carry relief to the wounded soldier, delights in divesting plagues and fevers of their terrors, and smiles even when death presents his gloomiest terrors. It has its true resting-place alone in the Christian's heart—there it lives and flourishes, because the love of Christ only can woo it fully forth in man's nature. If it go forth and seek one spirit as its peculiar object, and the strong and active unites itself with the tender and gentle, the twain grow together as one, and through all time and eternity, remain united with the blessing of God resting upon them. But, that this love should thus flourish and bear fruit, it is necessary that the body, the instrument through which it acts, should be in perfect condition, able to endure all things in its gentle ministrations, and sufficient for the work which Providence furnishes it.

How happily was the idea of strength and virtue expressed by one word in the Latin! And love without strength of body, is love with its wings clipped. No longer either able to fly or even to walk, it is comparatively impotent as regards the performance of good to its fellow-men. We are not allowed to take our lives into our own hands unnecessarily, because they are God's, and we have our duties to our fellow-men continually pressing upon us. If we take not every care in the preservation of our health, we shall not be able to exhibit that indication of "pure religion and undefiled," which James says consists in visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction.

But our duties to ourselves also require that we should cultivate high health. One of the first commands to fallen man was, that, in the sweat of his face, he should eat bread. To labor so long as we remain on earth is our duty—our pleasure, we might say; for labor gives zest to life. The truly miserable man, is he, who has no employment for his mental or bodily faculties, who sighs in the morn-

ing for the arrival of the evening, and at nightfall prays that the light may speedily return. With him, who labors either mentally or bodily, the day is *never* too long. Conscientiously endeavoring to perform his duties, he feels that he is obeying God's own command, and this lightens his toil.

We have no right to speak of trusting in Providence, while we reject the means he places at our disposal for the satisfaction of all our needs. It is, in fact, a species of irreverence which usage has permitted. Far more reverent was the command of Cromwell: "Put trust in God and keep your powder dry," than the folding of hands and pretended resignation to the events of the day, without an effort, fairly and honestly made, to force them to act for our own benefit. Dr. Lee, on this subject, well says: "Patience, which is perhaps the greatest, is also the last of the virtues, the sheet-anchor of the soul, not to be had recourse to till a a tempest has fallen upon us out of heaven, and we are in extremity. Let us never preach patience, when we can point out the means which shall render patience unnecessary. The patience which endures removable evils is not acceptable—it is an insult to the Almighty: It is not a grace of the spirit, but one of those lusts of the flesh 'which war against the soul,' and against the body also."

Notwithstanding all our attention to rules of hygeine and the most careful compliance with the requirements of science, yet disease invades the secret recesses of the organic system, bringing with it pain and suffering. "Although affliction cometh not forth of the dust, neither doth trouble spring out of the ground; yet man is born unto trouble, as the sparks fly upward." At the mere mention of the word disease, a shade of sadness passes over the human countenance; for from it have arisen "the thousand natural shocks that flesh is heir to." Visions of sleepless nights and days of torture come before us, when the spirit, aweary of the pains and troubles of mortality, is groaning for release and even disposed to complain that it is not set free from its companion, the body. How we are all able to realize, to

the full extent, the meaning of the word, from personal experience, and from watching by the couch of those who have suffered and died! Enshrouded in gloom, invested with appalling terrors, a frightful object indeed is disease to the natural man! Does it not imply a loss of relish for the beauties of the fair world around us, a deprivation of that appreciation for the wonderful and sublime which we possess in full health? It is presented as the antipode of happiness, the synonyme for misery. We associate it with the idea of extreme misfortune, and look upon those who have devoted themselves with full zeal to its alleviation as men who prey upon the miseries of mankind. All are willing to admit that it is a grand and beautiful sight to witness a man in the full tide of health, each organ performing its function with regularity and precision, the life-current of blood running its appointed course gaily and vigorously through the system. Herein they are willing to recognize one of the evidences, which that mis-named science, Natural Theology, is ready to bring forth, of the wisdom, goodness and greatness of the Almighty Creator. In health, there are marks on all sides of design. A perfect structure, full of proofs of consummate skill stands before them. But in sickness, according to the general notion, evidences of defect appear in the organic functions of life, and few are willing to recognize the wonderful indications of design which disease sets before them. We will be but giving the complement of our subject by occupying some space with the subject of disease as viewed from the Christian stand-point.

Disease may seize our bodies, either from what is generally known as accident, as a penalty for violations of laws of health and for an immoral life, or from causes which are hidden from human ken. In whatever way sickness comes, it is by divine appointment. We arrive at this conclusion from the frequent mention in Holy Writ of the direct agency of God in causing disease and even death to attack the people of Israel; and the character of these instances, does not justify us in the belief that they were

exceptional, but that they were the results of a regular law. So long as we permit the idea, that it is from Satanic influence, we shall not be able to endure, with resignation, the pangs and anguish which it brings. Duncan, in his excellent little essay on "*God in Disease*," says that, "from the case of Job, we are warranted in concluding that Satan can neither put forth his finger to touch a single individual, nor carry his malicious designs one step further than the divine persuasion is pleased to allow. Viewed in this light, the intervention of Satan, if it really exist, cannot properly be regarded as the cause of the occurrence of the disease, seeing that he is only an inferior instrument in carrying out the designs of Him who doeth according to His will in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth." *

There is a special reason why this notion of Satanic agency, in the production of disease, should be overthrown. Those who are acting under its suggestions, purposely avoid such aids as nature, through the science of medicine, may offer for the relief of pain and suffering. They hope, by prayer and reliance upon a miraculous interposition of divine power, to be freed from suffering, and refuse all material aid which nature may afford. A similar mistaken idea fills the minds of those, at times, who even believe that disease is the result of divine command, and they refuse to interfere with it, saying that God has sent it as a punishment for sin, and that it is arrogating to ourselves the right to interfere with His appointments, if we dare to adopt means for the removal of the cause of sickness. Such a position can only be explained by the existence of fanaticism, and can be justified in no way at all. It is really the highest order of irreverence to assume the ability to interpret that which God has, for reasons sufficient to Himself, kept concealed from us. And this we do, when we declare that all disease is intended for punishment. Such an explanation is not furnished us in the Holy Scriptures, nor is it a legitimate deduction from any of the articles of our holy faith. When we are deprived of

* God in Disease, 13.

such authorities for opinions on sacred subjects, all conjectures are merely gropings in an unfathomable darkness, where no glimmer of light can be had for the guidance of our steps.

Besides all this, we know that nature, with a free and liberal hand, offers us that which will alleviate disease, bring relief to the bed-ridden sufferer, and remove pain from the distressed. If disease be a patent fact, then also is this a patent fact, that the same God, who has established it, has furnished with a liberal hand, healing balsams and curative medicines in the three forms in which he has been pleased to create matter. If one be an evidence of His power, so also is the other. We are taught in "the Wisdom of the son of Sirach," that we should "honor a physician with the honor due unto him, for the uses which ye may have of him: for the Lord hath created him. For of the most High cometh healing, and he shall have honor of the king. The skill of the physician shall lift up his head: and in the sight of the great men he shall be in admiration. The Lord hath created medicines out of the earth; and he that is wise will not abhor them. * * Then give place to the physician, for the Lord hath created him: let him not go from thee, for thou hast need of him. There is a time, when in their hands there is good success." And we also read, that one of the chosen twelve was *Luke, the beloved physician.*

If we were placed in this world, with all its products as ministers to our wants in one form or other, then there is a solemn necessity for us to cultivate an acquaintance with nature, so that we may know the extent of our power, and use it with thankfulness to the Being from whom it has come. This necessity becomes more and more pressing as knowledge increases in the earth. A much less excuse would have justified a man for neglecting it years ago than now. If the fear of the Lord is the beginning of true knowledge, it is evidently not intended that we should avoid acquainting ourselves with those facts which will enable us all the more to appreciate His wonderful power.

When sickness and suffering result from what is generally called accident, we are most often totally unable to account for them. The world is accustomed to associate the word accident with the idea of chance or blind fate. But wherever fatality exists, there also exists denial of the existence of a Divine Providence. The Christian can believe that his God, "behind a frowning providence, hides a smiling face." With Job, he can say, "Though He slay me, yet I will trust in Him." When losses of property and substance are conjoined with the death of all that is near and dear, he can bless the Lord, and piously exclaim, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away."

But disease is often also the result of wicked conduct or willful violation of the laws of health. Here we are enabled to detect the relation of effect to cause, at times, with wonderful accuracy; and it is well it is so, since mere considerations as to the consequences of a wicked career, or of carelessness as to health, may sometimes produce a reformation. If we see a long continued career of intemperance terminating in an enfeebled body, a shattered nervous system, and a brutalization of the finer faculties of man, we do not hesitate to attribute these to it as the cause. Or when the terrors of an attack of *delirium tremens* present themselves—when horrible shapes and forms are tormenting the poor sufferer with terrors more awful than those which the earth in reality can afford—when helpless and hopeless, he seems as if undergoing the torments of the damned even while on earth, and friends fly his bedside as though escaping from a loathsome object, here we have no difficulty in pointing out the exact cause and origin of all this array of frightful symptoms. When the glutton complains of the effects of a confirmed dyspepsia, the student of oppressive palpitations of the heart, or an unsettling of the nervous system—when the slave of passion or lust shows his body all hideous and loathsome with ulcers and disease, we have no hesitation in pointing out certain violations of the laws of God, as the direct and immediate causes of these effects. Our judgment is not at fault un-

der such circumstances. There are, however, other cases, where we can find no assignable cause for the origin of the disease, and it is irreverent to declare that there must have been some sin for which God has sent the disease. It is then not reasonable to conclude that disease is the punishment for sin. Are not the good often stretched upon beds of sickness—for days, weeks, months and years the subjects of anguish and pain? The little infant, before its reasoning faculties have fitted it for indulgence in sin and its fruits, endures pain, spends sleepless nights, seems destined to undergo, with inevitable certainty, a fixed course of diseases, which the physician finds often are beyond the power of his science. First comes the nervous and febrile sufferings consequent upon teething, then whooping cough and measles, chicken-pox and scarlet-fever, mumps and diseases incident upon hot weather and foul air. Surely these can not be sent as *punishments*, and, if we cannot see their necessity, it behooves us reverently to acknowledge our ignorance. A man's knowledge is none the less respected because he confesses that of which he is ignorant.

While, however, we dare not look upon all disease as sent for punishment, we may look upon it as intended sometimes for correction. The chastening influences of sickness have proven blessed, beyond the power of words to express, to many a man's soul; and the sick bed has become thus a dear place to memory, as by its influence and monitions the wanderer has been made to see his error and has obtained that strength and courage and knowledge which enable him to retrace his steps, and begin his career of life, as it were, anew.

The Christian has learned to kiss the rod, however severe may be the blow which it has given him. In any view, we are safe to conclude that sickness is *for the glory of God.* While we are commanded to glorify God in our body, it is not stated that such an end can only be attained in health, but it may also be reached when the whole system is racked with disease. When the latter is not the result of any misconduct on our part, there is great room for doing good,

even through the submissive spirit with which it is endured. Who has not felt, as he left the bed side of an humble, patient Christian soul, that its gentleness and endurance most beautifully illustrated the strength of the Christian's hopes, and the strength of that foundation on which all these hopes were placed. The gold that is tried in the fire, that is rubbed by the burnisher's hand, only comes forth the more brilliant for the treatment it has received. It is purified from the dross, and is more precious for the separation. The corrections of the divine hand are extended in mercy even to the erring and sinful, and are hardly to be considered as the evidences of an angry God.

In another point of view, disease is preservative. There is something foreign to the human system, latent in its inmost recesses, which would work its entire destruction, did not the preservative effects of disease remove the peccant substance from the system. Medicine furnishes us with a host of illustrations of this fact, and the main use of its armament of remedies is not so much to cure disease, as to aid nature in her efforts to throw off morbific matter. It is nature that cures diseases, medicines only aid her efforts, give power where she is almost powerless, strength where weakness prevails, and the gentle stimulus to functions that when fully aroused, will drive the intruder from its lurking place. A strong proof of design is thus furnished from the history of disease. Duncan has illustrated this admirably:* "Let us for a moment suppose, that in exploring some remote and uninhabited quarter of the globe, we were unexpectedly to come upon the remains of some gorgeous temple, which displayed the marks of great beauty in its original formation, but which had been levelled with the ground shortly after its completion—not by the action of the elements on its mouldering materials, nor by the ruthless hand of violence, but by a person of equal skill, with its original architect, as evidenced by the care and attention bestowed in the position of the prostrate portions—

* God in Disease, 21.

would not the attentive observer be irresistibly led to the conclusion, that some circumstance having occurred to render the continuance of the edifice in the locality originally selected inexpedient, the owner of the building, or perhaps the architect himself, enamoured of his work, and unwilling that it should be destroyed, had superintended the process of taking it down, with the intention of rearing it again in a new and more permanent position." Thus is it in disease. The same wonderful adaptation of means to ends pervades the human body in disease or in health. Although the vital actions may be broken up or suspended in some organs, yet those which take their place show the same wonderful evidences of design throughout their every portion. When inflammation attacks an organ, the blood vessels show themselves fully prepared to meet the emergency, and all morbid affections are but illustrations of the same result. The hand of God is seen in the history of disease full as well as when the glow of health mantles the cheek, and the blood courses gaily through its cunningly devised channels, visiting all parts of the body and bearing life to them all.

In another point of view, however, disease is often a blessing. It tries friendships, and shows when and where they may be trusted. The sunshine friends, those butterflies of formality and fashion, flee from the sick bed. Those who had fawned upon us, flattered our pride and taken advantage of our weakness, no longer are found by our sides. It is an awful thing for the weak and insincere to be by the bedside of suffering humanity; hypocrisy there cannot feign an interest which it does not feel. Hence we do not find many left to minister to our wants, of those who had pledged true friendship and had prated to us of unending affection. The touch-stone of affliction has been applied, and a base alloy, with a poor film of gilding has been found, instead of the true metal which the external appearance had indicated. Those who are true and reliable, cling to us all the closer for our sufferings. The sympathizing breast opens up all its sympathies in such a trial, and shows

how reliable all its pretensions have been. Affliction is, indeed, the grand test for the friendships of this world. Those who are proven by it should be prized as above all price.

But if all friends desert us at such a time, even this itself may be, to the truly devout, a blessing, assuring them there is no love on earth equal to that which Christ himself manifests toward his suffering members. Under such circumstances, it is the rock of ages which becomes the only reliable resting-place for our hopes and expectations of succor. The Christian is drawn nearer and closer to his Saviour, and feels that from Him alone can help in time of need be expected. His faith becomes stronger, and he draws comfort from Christ as from a well of living waters.

Ordinarily, we look upon the sensation of pain as an evil, but physiology shows us, that in this we are mistaken. One of the great blessings to man is the fact that we can feel pain. It is a protection to our bodies, as it bids us attend to that which may do irremediable injury. In a state of health, man is not conscious of the existence of any special organs within his body. It is only when disease attacks the latter, that he begins to be aware of their presence, or to know that he has such organs as the stomach, liver, lungs or heart. The sensation of pain directs his attention to the seat of the disease, and enables him to reason as to the correct remedy.

The sensation of pain is dependent upon the nervous system. Where nerves do not exist, there no injury would produce pain. The nails may be pared and the hair cut without the sensation of pain. Its distribution is then to parts where its presence would be required for protection, and nowhere else. Thus the skin, which covers the whole external surface of the body, is largely endowed with nerves of sensation, not universally even distributed over it. The thick covering of the heel has different sensibility from that of the fingers. If the sensibility were great in the former, every step taken would be agony to the human frame; were it small in the latter, then the great utility of the

sense of tact would be destroyed. The common idea, that bones are exceedingly sensitive, and that the marrow is peculiarly so, has its erroneousness demonstrated whenever the surgeon is called on to remove a limb. He knows that the first sweep of the knife, with which he severs the skin, produces pain beyond all other portions of the operation, that the incision of muscle and the sawing of bone will be as nothing to it. The great seat of sensation is the skin, because those substances must come into contact with it, which would be of injury to the body.

The reviewer of "Rowell's essay on the beneficent distribution of the sense of pain," in the London Quarterly, says: "Without pain, we could not proportion our actions to the strength of our frame, or our exertions to its powers of endurance. In the impetuosity of youth, we should strike blows that would crush our hands and break our arms; we should take leaps that would dislocate our limbs; and no longer taught by fatigue that the muscles needed repose, we should continue our sports and our walking tours till we had worn out the living tissue with the same unconsciousness that we now wear out our coats and our shoes."

Had we space, we might show how the sensation of pain is sometimes wonderfully acute, in some parts of the vital structure, where ordinarily no nervous sensibility appears present; and again, how it is deadened and quieted. A mere reference to the frequent cessation of pain, as the moment of final dissolution arrives, is all that can be allowed us. It is a common occurrence in many diseases, that the sensation of pain entirely disappears just before death. It has sounded the alarm from the first inception of the disease—has reported accurately the extent of the injury, so long as hope remained that nature, with the assistance of medicine, could remove it. But all its alarms have proven ineffectual, the citadel of life cannot hold out any longer against the violent attacks of disease. It must surrender; nothing in the world is to be gained by continued reports of danger. The end is at hand, and is inevitable. The

sensation of pain ceases, and what a blessing that the last moments on earth can be spent with an unclouded mind —that the soul can make its peace with its God, throw off all its inimical feelings for the world, and with a quiet calm close its eyes upon the fading beauties of this life, to open upon those of another which shall be unfading and eternal. The waters of death are sometimes very dark and dreary, and the good Christian is almost forced to cry out: "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me," but in the greater number of cases, the bodily anguish disappears, and the spirit longs to attain its rest where God has prepared eternal freedom from pain and suffering. Death, then, to the good man, illustrates the divine beneficence, as exhibited in the laws which govern the human body.

If the view we have taken of our subject is correct, and not one of mere fancy, it is easy to perceive that the errors which pervade general belief are by no means small or unimportant. The human body cannot be a something to be despised by man. It was made as the crowning act of God's creation; as though, through him, as the grand exponent of nature, the works of God might find a fitting agent to pour back, in articulate words, never ceasing hymns of praise and honor. The primal pair—

> Godlike erect, with native honor clad
> In naked majesty, seem'd lords of all,
> And worthy seem'd: for in their looks divine
> The image of their glorious Maker shone,
> Truth, wisdom, sanctitude severe and pure,
> Severe, but in true filial freedom plac'd,
> Whence true authority in men: though both
> Not equal, as their sex not equal, seem'd;
> For contemplation he and valor form'd,
> For softness she and sweet attractive grace;
> He for God only, she for God in him.
> * * * * * *
> Adam, the goodliest man of men since born
> His sons, the fairest of her daughters Eve."

The soul and body were then, as with all their descendants, inseparably yoked together, during this earthly life, and after a short separation, produced by death, will again be united nevermore to be sundered. Whatever joys hea-

ven may have in store for the soul will be enjoyed by the body; whatever sorrows and torments the gloomy regions of hell may have reserved for the soul, those also will the body suffer. Both must either reign in triumph, or both suffer eternal despair. There is no prospect of a divorce of the two. The salvation which was brought to man, was not only one affecting the soul, but the body also.

And in addition to all that has been said on this subject, one other consideration may yet be mentioned as justifying all we have claimed in the way of respect for the human body. Christ Himself, before leaving his disciples, instituted the solemn Eucharistic Sacrament, calling the bread and wine, which was employed for this purpose, His body and His blood, and enjoining them to repeat this solemnity in remembrance of Him. And when the Jews, on a previous occasion had cavilled at this saying, that he would give His flesh for the life of the world, His answer was: "Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." These words, involving as they do the awful mystery of the presence of Christ's real body and blood in the Eucharistic Sacrament, should make those, whose precious privilege it has been to partake of this priceless blessing, duly respect that body which has thus been the recipient of the blessed elements.

We close by another quotation from Dr. Lee: "Unless mankind shall be taught to take a conscientious interest in their bodily welfare, they will hardly be persuaded to feel that concern which they ought, in the health and salvation of their souls. He cannot be expected to aspire after eternal life who has not learned to appreciate the blessing of temporal life." "He that is unfaithful in that which is least, is unfaithful also in much."

Baltimore, Md. L. H. S.

ART. IV.—AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY: WITH AN OUTLINE TREATISE ON LOGIC. By the Rev. E. V. GERHART, D. D. President of Franklin and Marshall College. *I am the truth.*—CHRIST. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858.

From its foundation, Marshall College has been distinguished for the earnest and profound attention paid to the science of man, both psychologically and morally considered. In this respect it received, and still bears, the distinct impress of the character of its first President, Dr. Rauch. The success of Dr. Rauch, in transplanting to American soil, and acclimatizing here the choicest fruits of the best German schools of philosophy, as well as in the improvement of the transplantations, by skillfully combining with them everything susceptible and worthy of appropriation, from English systems, excited general admiration. His psychology, though prepared under the immense disadvantages of an attempt to furnish an elementary work, in the most difficult department of science, in a language not only foreign to the author, but exceedingly meagre in its psychological nomenclature, has justly been allowed to constitute an epoch in metaphysics, and this too, more emphatically than can be claimed for any English or American work, in the same branch of study, before or since. We do not say that it called forth as much loud applause as some others, or that its influence has been as frequently and as frankly acknowledged. Many considerations have probably prevented this being done. It is a sad but undeniable fact, that even the republic of letters is often degraded by the predominance of petty envies and contemptible jealousies. Dr. Rauch was a German, though a gentleman and a Christian; and how could that class of critics, whose capital stock of criticism and callow wit consists of sweeping denunciations void of reason, and

detractive ridicule void of truth, allow so tempting an opportunity of disposing of their superfluous ware, to pass unimproved? Dr. Rauch was the president of a young and promising institution, which was rapidly taking position abreast of many Colleges much older and more advantageously circumstanced than itself, to say nothing of those it left lagging in the rear; and why, if even nothing could be decorously said in condemnation of his book, why should it behoove rivals to proclaim its real merits, or help it into deserved popularity? Dr. Rauch, finally, was the head of a College which had been reared by the zeal, and which was fostered by the care of the Reformed Church; and why should the leading organs, or prominent worthies of other denominations, make themselves busy-bodies in other men's matters, by holding up a sister Church to public admiration?

Such considerations do not, of course, operate in every breast. There are noble men to be found in all ecclesiastical households, in spite of the untoward influences which may surround and pervade them; men who cannot be bound by the contractions of bigotry, and whose standard of excellency, and rule of commendation, are not partizanship, but merit. And yet the general complaint implied in the statements of the preceding paragraph has only too much ground in fact. Even where moral courage or hardihood is wanting openly or unqualifiedly to denounce a good work, issuing from an envied source, the despicable purpose is often betrayed, to assassinate it secretly, or to hasten its demise by silent neglect.

How many illustrations in point might be gathered from some of the Reviews and Repertories which have been issued within the last few years! How significant the morale, when long articles are written, for the sake of disposing of vexatiously troublesome arguments, in contemptuous footnotes of nearly three octavo pages of nonpareil or agate! Were erudition and place never to be secured or held, but in combination with such a spirit, one might almost be tempted to wish that there were no learning, by the successful

acquisition of which jealousies are so frequently kindled, and no dignities, by the conferring of which envy is so often inflamed.

But whether acknowledged or disowned, it is simply a fact, that the Marshall College text-book in Mental Science, has been, from its first issue, exerting a widely spread influence upon this department of study, in American Colleges. Even where it has not been recognized or adopted as a class manual, its materials have, doubtless, in many cases, been appropriated and turned to good practical account. And possibly some who have had no better judgment to pass upon it, than Dr. Johnson passed upon that leg of mutton, which, *after he had devoured it*, he pronounced to be "as bad as bad could be, ill-fed, ill-killed, ill-kept, and ill-dressed," have nevertheless contrived, like Dr. Johnson, to combine assimilation with condemnation, and free use with free abuse.

The high position taken by Marshall College at its start, in metaphysical studies, was fully sustained and very ably developed by the second President, Dr. Nevin, who strengthened the foundations previously laid, and consolidated, beautified and carried forward the superstructure which had been reared thereon. Whilst Dr. Nevin occupied the presidential chair, the department of morals and ethics, we have been repeatedly informed, was most sedulously and successfully cultivated; and frequent regrets have been expressed and continue to be expressed, that he has thus far steadily declined publishing his course of lectures upon this science. This is the more to be deplored, as a satisfactory text-book upon Christian Ethics is one of the greatest educational necessities of our day. For whatever merit may attach to the work of Dr. Wayland, and the more recent "Outlines of Moral Science" by the late Archibald Alexander, D. D., they do not meet, and cannot meet existing and deeply felt wants, upon this most important subject.

From the aim and character of the work announced at the head of this notice, we rejoice to see that Marshall Col-

lege has not sacrificed its high estimate of metaphysical studies by its transplantation to Lancaster, and its union with Franklin College. The old genius still survives and reigns. A Christian philosophy, a philosophy which shall be truly philosophical, and vindicate and authenticate itself as such, by demonstrations of its full harmony with the fundamental facts and principles of the Christian religion —this shall continue to be advocated by the first chair in the College, under its new form and name, as it was so ably and so faithfully done under the old; and this shall continue to give a healthy vitality and a safe impetus to all the other kinds of knowledge acquired. For without having the mind stored with the living principles of a Christian philosophy, the acquisition of learning might make man a capital steamer or balloon, but he would be a steamer without pilot or rudder, and a balloon without an escape-valve or ballast.

Whatever else our Colleges and higher institutions of learning may dispatch in a superficial way, let the γνωθι σεαυτον, always be most sedulously cultivated. No branch of the usual course should by any means be underrated or slighted. Each has its proper office, in the educational development of the real scholar; and the course prescribed for each, both as to time and extent, is unquestionably limited enough, unless that for mathematics may be an exception. There is, therefore, no room for curtailment. Were it practicable, indeed, it would be well to devote double the time now allotted to the languages, especially to the philosophy of language, to the natural sciences, to history, and to belles-lettres. In each of these departments a higher standard of scholarship would be desirable, and greater proficiency should be expected, than is commonly demanded or acquired.

But in our American Colleges, we fear, the metaphysical course is apt to be put off, in the majority of cases, with the dullest attentions. The necessary result is, that most of our collegiate graduates know vastly more about mathematical mechanics than metaphysics, and can speak

with far greater familiarity of the laws, the qualities and operations of the outer than of those of the inner πνευμα. But upon what rational grounds can this be justified? Are the winds of so much more account than the immortal spirit of man, to which the great Creator has made even the mighty blasts of Boreas measurably subservient, that a diploma'd scholar should be expected to know more about Pneumatics, even, than Psychology? Is it more important that a student should be able safely to cross "the Ass' bridge," than know the psychological difference between himself and that despised quadruped—between the attributes and qualities of his intellect and its instinct?

Assuredly, next to theology, the noblest study of man, is intellectual man himself. We believe moreover, that this study, properly guided and prosecuted, would prove the very best discipline for the mind. Logic, at least, as a branch of this department of science, is as exact in its definitions, and requires as thorough abstraction in the solution of its problems, as mathematics, in the modern sense of this term. And if as much attention and time were usually given to metaphysical studies, as are always, in a complete academical course, devoted to mathematics, we feel persuaded that the result would be a vastly greater degree of intellectual, especially ratiocinative, power. But think of all our regular graduates being indiscriminately kept plodding (often in direct opposition to their natural tastes) for eight years, or more, through Algebra, Geometry, the Trigonometries, the Calculi, Mathematical Mechanics, Astronomy, &c., &c., whilst to Intellectual Philosophy and Logic are, as it were, grudgingly allotted the fifth part of the last few terms of the collegiate course!

It is difficult to conceive upon what grounds this very common mistake can be justified. The disciples of the Utilitarian school may, indeed, urge the immense practical uses to which the mathematics can be put, and their indispensableness to the prosecution and perfection of the various branches of material science. But this plea involves a petitio principii. Our objection is not that math-

ematics are unimportant, and merit less attention than they usually receive; but that their importance should be magnified above that of other disciplines, which are intrinsically of higher account, and that equally high attainments in them should be demanded indiscriminately of all graduates, to the comparative disparagement or neglect of nobler studies. Let those, who have a calling to those professions which necessarily deal in algebraic equations and trigonometrical problems, obey their excellent vocation to its last solutions. It is no doubt a good work to square triangles, and determine cometic parallaxes. At least we, who have no eye for such abstractions, are willing to walk here by faith in the testimony of others. Doubtless the world is vastly indebted to services thus rendered by patient Euclids and authors of celestial mechaniques. But for their persevering toils, we should be ignorant of the size and weight of the sun and moon, the distances of the nearest fixed stars, the exact hour and duration of periodical eclipses and planetary transits, and other facts of incalculable interest. Let them labor on, and let their thinning ranks be continually supplied with new recruits! But however important such labors, in this view, may be, there is no reason why the complete ground work of them should be laid, without exception, in the mind of every one taking a collegiate course, unless this can be done without prejudice to what we may term more catholic disciplines. The physician, the jurist, the theologian, the ecclesiastic, may most successfully serve their several vocations, without having mastered the higher mathematics. But neither the mathematician, nor they, can claim the possession of the truest knowledge, so long as their own mind continues a sphere unexplored, or only superficially examined.

The deep interest we feel in this subject has, however, led us undesignedly to enlarge upon it, and deviate somewhat from the original purpose of this paper, which was briefly to set forth the merits of Dr. Gerhart's manual. It consists of two distinct and yet intimately connected parts. The first part contains a compendious introduction to the

study of Philosophy, in the higher sense of that term. This, already, serves to indicate the great significance attached to the science, by the author of the work. It is a new feature in English and American text-books, and in our metaphysical course of study. It is one, moreover, which must commend itself to general approval and imitation. There is no chapel in the great cathedral of science which, more than this one, needs and deserves to have a vestibule or porch, in which those seeking admittance may pause reflectingly, and ponder the character of the place they are about to enter, and the nature of the duty in which they are about to engage. Every other branch of study is preceded by a preparatory regimen, peculiar to each; how much more should this be the case with the higher Philosophy. Such an introduction, also, is well calculated to impress the student with a proper sense of the importance of the discipline which is now to engross his attention, and of the superior dignity of the science of man. By mastering the preliminaries unfolded here, under the respective heads of: The Reason, Consciousness, The Nature of Philosophy, A true system of Philosophy, Logic and its Relations, he will gain some intelligent conception of the nature of the work before him, and enter the new field with his eyes open. His curiosity will be awakened, and his ability to gratify that curiosity, by a well digested assimilation of what is offered to it, will be greatly increased. There will then be, not so much of a mechanical cramming of the mind with isolated propositions and dead facts, as of a quick apprehension and appropriation of verities in their true organic relations to each other, as vital parts of a living whole. The student will not merely see, but perceive; not merely remember, but know.

But the "Introduction to Philosophy," besides possessing this interesting peculiarity as such, exhibits a distinguishing characteristic of still greater importance, in the preliminary steps it takes towards the construction of a system of mental science upon the Christological principle. The novelty here does, of course, not consist in an attempt

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

to make even metaphysics subservient to religion, and especially to the Christian religion. All Christian incumbents of the chairs of mental science in our literary institutions have, undoubtedly, always endeavored to combine lessons of piety, with lectures upon Philosophy; to inculcate, possibly, even Platonism with prayer, and amalgamate what is worse than Platonism, Materialism, with pious monitions. Indeed, many have made their metaphysics unnaturally devout, and rendered the whole subject ridiculous, if not repulsive, by substituting sermons for scientific lectures, and homilies for syllogisms. And the matter has, frequently, in such cases, been no way improved by the obvious incongruity between the learned professor's theology and psychology, the one being, possibly, as orthodox as the canons of Dort, and the other more heathenish than Aristotle.

It is one thing, however, to combine pious cant with a system of philosophy essentially heterogeneous to the Gospel, and quite another to assume the central fact of that Gospel, as the true basis of philosophy, and upon it to construct the entire system. However beautifully, false and fundamentally un-Christian systems, may be decorated with gems borrowed from the casket of divine truth, such systems cannot be thereby authenticated or sanctified. They cannot, even by such pious artifice, be rendered less really pernicious in their permanent educational influence. Bad principles, though arrayed in the most evangelical drapery, retain their poisonous properties, as truly as hemlock in a silver cup. And bad principles, though disseminated as good seed in the name of Gospel truth, will take root according to their own real nature, in the minds of many students, and among them those of more thoughtful habits, and produce their legitimately bad fruits, despite all contrary desires. Nearly all the philosophical and theological troubles of Germany during the last hundred years may be thus accounted for; so may the deism and scepticism of England. Excrescences upon sound principles, produced by the effort of outward foes to secure a nest for their larvae, are far less

to be feared and deprecated, than such radical errors, though these be presented in clusters as enticing to the eye as the grapes of Gomorrah. A tree, healthy at heart and wholesome by nature, will rise superior to such encumbering excrescences, and yield its good fruit in spite of them. Or the worst that can happen to it is its speedy decay, in consequence of the harm externally inflicted. But a tree hurtful by nature, carries in itself the power of perpetuating injurious properties, and of spreading the mischief of which it is a living source; and no skill can change its real character, or prevent its development into pernicious results. Its poison will infect even the best fruits that may be grafted upon it.

The importance, therefore, of having our systems of metaphysics rooted in correct religious principles, and animated and shaped by their plastic power, cannot be overestimated. Every such system must have some basis, some starting point, the influence of which will run through all its ramifications; and which will run the more vitally, the more truly the particular scheme advocated or constructed is an organic system. Now in a general way but three such bases can be conceived of; one that is pure error, one that possesses a mixed character, and finally, the pure truth. The first being essentially and wholly bad, must exhibit its bad character in all the various processes of its development. It can never rise and remain above its level, any more than water. By some extraneous influences, or occasional internal commotions, it may seem at times as though it would break away from its bed, and find a higher channel for itself. But, like the jets of some sulphurous geyser, it will soon sink again, and move on in its old low foul course. All the deductions and applications of such a system will betray their pernicious origin. Whether it beget poets, or painters, chemists, geologists, or astronomers, historians, philologists or theologians, its evil animus, and even its distorted lineaments will cleave to its progeny, like the plague to the leper.

Nor will the operations and results of a system resting

upon a mixed basis be much, if any, less deplorable. The attending symptoms may not be so painful and offensive, but the final issues will usually prove as fatal. Some poisons operate so gently as to conceal their agency in the death they produce; and even the administering of them may be successfully covered by harmless condiments. Poets may sing of the omnipotence of truth, and the certainty of its final victory over error. But we must take heed lest pleasant poetry lull us here into a false security. Its song may be a cheering and trustworthy prophecy; but what ages of dire conflicts have been passed through since its first utterance, and what battles must still be fought before its final fulfilment! And who shall count the myriads of slain with which the various fields of strife shall till then be covered? It should never be forgotten that in the case of all such mixed systems, the constituent truth and error of them are not the only factors. The arena of their conflict with each other—the human reason—becomes an active partizan in their antagonisms. It mattered not to Marathon, whether the Persians or the Grecians, Mardonius or Miltiades, triumphed. But in the struggle between Christ and Belial, on the living field of humanity, humanity itself rises up and enters into the conflict. It cannot remain neutral; its own mental and moral powers are the agents in the warfare. And its choice of parties will be determined by its natural predilections—these again by the ground law of its life. But this law, in fallen and depraved man, is sin. If, therefore, the reason of the natural and unrenewed man becomes the field of this conflict between the elements of a mixed system of philosophy, his proclivity to the error of that system will soon show itself, the error will gain the preponderance, and, if no special intervening grace prevent, truth, unwilling to be subservient, will flee and leave the sole sway to error. The light will endure no such subordinate fellowship with darkness.

The only safe alternative, therefore, is to make pure truth, wherever it may be obtained, the root and ground work of philosophy. The system must grow out of truth as the tree out of its germ; or as a branch out of some pa-

rent trunk. The truth must make the philosophy, not philosophy the truth. Philosophy is worthy of our favor and confidence only as it is true; the truth claims and merits our regard and our faith for its own sake. Indeed, philosophy is living and organic, in the highest sense, only as it is the product and development of truth under this form. It is this element alone which gives it a positive, and therefore a permanent and enduring existence; which knits its parts and joints compactly together, so that it can endure the day of trial. Error is a lie, a negation, a *no-thing*, a dark shadow of the truth, and can, therefore, never furnish a lasting bond of being to any system. Error, joined with truth, is like making a chain with alternate clay and iron links. What can be bound together with such a chain? We must either take the truth alone, or find ourselves stultified in the end with all our finely wrought philosophies.

Let no one, therefore, be deceived by specious protestations of philosophers or philosophies, to the intent that they are neutral, and therefore harmless, in regard to religion; that they start from principles which are indifferent alike to all theosophies, and therefore equally impartial to all. The very ignoring of all such fundamental relationships is a fraud, and assumes an impossibility. Earth has never seen such a monstrosity as this would be. And until children can be begotten without parental, or special divine agencies; until trees and plants can grow outside of all connection with their germs or their species, we shall never see systems of philosophy which will not be either false, or mixed, or true, according to the nature of their original source.

Now "a true system of philosophy depends upon a correct theology. The reason must know God before, properly speaking, it can know itself or the outer world scientifically. If it does not know God, or has a false idea of God, it cannot know itself truly, nor can it form a correct conception of its relative position. A false system of philosophy follows as a necessary consequence (see "Introduction, &c.," p. 94). The correctness of this position should be so obvious as to require no proof. It is continually assumed

and acted upon in the study of other sciences, and why should it be disputed or rejected in its application to the science of man? Until the universal law of gravitation was discovered and demonstrated, astronomy, with all its bright suns and planets and galaxies, stumbled like a man groping in the dark. But this point gained, astrologers became astronomers, and admiring star-gazers filled the minds of their fellow-men with admiration, by their scientific exhibition of the harmonies of the sphere. The mystery hidden from ages was revealed, and problems which had utterly perplexed sages of other times, were solved in a day. Then it became manifest why systems of astronomy previously constructed (for men would build such systems, however miserable the foundation on which they rested, and men believed them correct too, notwithstanding their gross absurdities) abounded in contradictions, and were constantly jarring against facts. They ignored, because they were ignorant of, the workings of the great centralizing law of the material universe. This error discovered and corrected, the path of the science became plain. Hosts of other errors fell with it, and in their stead sprang up a unique harmonious system, whose future history will, like that of truth itself, be development, not change. (See "Introduction, &c.," p. 93, 94).

But the great fact, of which this is only an analogy, is found within the limits of the science of rational man. Human minds have their true point of departure and their actual centre of revolution in God, more intimately and really than the planets of our system theirs in the sun, or than the system of all systems its centre in the Pleiades. We are the *offspring* of God, and our living dependent relation to Him has not been so wholly broken off, but that in Him we still live and move, and have our being.

"The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
Hath had elsewhere its setting,
And cometh from afar;
Not in entire forgetfulness,
Nor yet in utter nakedness,
But trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God who is our home."

All correct self-knowledge, therefore, must start from this grand fact. As the reason can no more shake off its dependent relation to God, the Father of all spirits, than the Earth or Jupiter can rid themselves of the power of that law which makes them gravitate towards the sun, or the sun and its attendant spheres throw off the invisible bonds which fasten them to Alcyone, it follows that the only point of observation from which that reason can be seen in its true nature, is the position already indicated. But there is only one correct system of theology, namely: that which is based upon the incarnation of the Son of God. Thus, then, as Christ incarnate is the starting point and central fact of the true history of the world, we must most emphatically make it the basis and supporting centre of the true philosophy of man.

And this is the ground work of the psychology to which the first part of the Manual before us, proposes to introduce the earnest inquiring student. The attempt to construct an entire system upon this basis, may be deemed by some an experiment. But it is a noble experiment, and reflects high credit upon the author. Of the ultimate success of this theory, there can be no doubt. It must be true. Even though Dr. Gerhart should fail to elaborate it consistently, and triumphantly to sustain it, other advocates will arise to carry on what has thus been commenced, until the cap-stone of the building shall be laid amid shouting and joy. Then it shall be seen that history, philosophy, and theology, like the trine nature of man himself—his body, soul and spirit—are one. They will find their unity in the Incarnate truth. The true nature of man will be discovered in Christ, who is very *man*. In him will be seen both the ground and the perfect ideal of humanity. And the true relation of the reason to the outer world will be discovered in Christ, who is the organic *union* of God and man. The person of Christ will be seen as the concrete resolution of all the fundamental problems in philosophy—the highest revelation of God—of man, of the world, and of their necessary reciprocal relations. He, therefore, will furnish

the solution of the broadest and most comprehensive problem, and must be the ultimate principle upon which alone every other problem in history, theology or philosophy, will be finally solved. (See "Introduction, &c.," p. 139.)

Of the application of the principles laid down in the first four chapters of Dr. Gerhart's Manual to Logic, and of the "Outline treatise on Logic" itself, we have not time to take any extended notice. The relations subsisting between Logic and Philosophy, as well as the other sciences, and the general nature of Logic itself, are well set forth in Chapter V., including §§ 39–50. No abstract that could be given of the contents of these pages would convey a just impression of their character, or do justice to the matters treated of. We must refer the reader to the book itself.

The second main part of the book before us is "An Outline Treatise of Logic. From the German of Dr. Joseph Beck," of Stuttgart. Its chief excellence consists in a characteristic which should distinguish every work of the kind: it is truly logical. The structure of the Treatise is, therefore, a practical illustration of the science exhibited. This, unfortunately, is more than can be said of every Manual of Logic which has hitherto appeared. And this peculiar merit of the present work will the more clearly appear, the more closely it is examined.

The conciseness of the Manual also commends it to favor. Whilst nothing is omitted which should be found in a text-book, there are no labor-saving redundancies for lazy professors. In this view of the book, we would honestly caution all phlegmatic incumbents of logical chairs (pity there should be chairs on a professor's rostrum) against its introduction. It will be likely to prove a distressing thorn in his easy flesh, and a disturbing fire in his oily bones, which will sadly unsettle his vis inertiae. But to the instructor who understands the nature and object of his office, and who takes pleasure in his work in proportion as it demands his liveliest energies, the Outline Treatise before us will be a favorite Manual.

Of the mechanical execution of the work, it is sufficient

to say that it is done in the best style of Lindsay and Blakiston, and leaves nothing to be desired either in regard to paper, type or general finish. And we only hope that it is the first of a complete series of philosophical works from the same pen and the same press.

Philadelphia, Pa. J. H. A. B.

ART. V.—THE OFFICE OF BISHOP.

Among the several great and leading ideas running through the Old and New Testaments, that of the kingdom of God is certainly as prominent as any other. This kingdom has been the centre of all true power in the world's history from the earliest ages, the great pioneer of civilization, the source of true science and learning, and the only sphere of divine grace and salvation. Yet its true nature has fully come to light only in the character of its great King, Jesus Christ, God's only begotten Son. Before this, the strong tendency was ever at hand, as it has been even since in many directions, to lose sight of its spiritual and supernatural character, and to regard it as one of the more elevated and noble forms of human thought and effort. Though fully organized under the first dispensation, and containing a grand ceremonial and types which were evidently of divine mould, yet, because it was inwoven with man's ordinary life and the civil polity on the one hand, and on the other, was destitute of its actual life and substance, as this was afterwards reached in its own proper development, it never stood forth in its wholly divine nature and its true supernatural glory. This has appeared only as it moved forward in the great current of history, and approximated the fulness of time; only as it saw

itself in Christ; only as He entered it and filled it with substantial contents, making it to be in reality, henceforth and forever, "His Body, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." At this point the twilight vanished and the true day dawned; the type and shadow of heavenly things disappeared, and the glorious substance itself took their place; and while men were constrained deeply to feel its great power, they no less clearly discerned its divine origin and heavenly nature: they saw that the kingdom of heaven had, by the divine law of expansion, really reached down to earth.

To teach and illustrate the nature of this kingdom, its rich resources and heavenly powers, was the prime object of Christ as the great prophet sent of God. We see this especially in his parables, which nearly all begin with the words, "*The kingdom of heaven is like unto.*" Whether He uses the figure of the seed, of leaven, of a treasure in a field, of a merchantman seeking goodly pearls, or of a great net cast into the sea catching in its ample folds every variety of fish, in each and every case the great design is to illustrate the nature of this spiritual kingdom. All nature is thus brought into service and constituted one grand parable, with a view to set forth, in a clear way, the varied aspects, excellencies and glories of this higher world.

There are other great kingdoms, such as the mineral, the animal and the human, but the kingdom of God is prior to, and wider, deeper and more enduring than all these. It is the real basis of all these, their moulding type and their true consummation; and all these simply natural kingdoms are true to themselves only in so far as they freely take up its life and represent its glory. The kingdom of God, though different from the world, is not on this account separated from it. It is, indeed, the supernatural, but the supernatural in the natural, the spiritual in the carnal, the heavenly in the earthly; and is designed, like the principle of leaven in meal, to pervade and transform all the powers of nature, until old things shall pass away and all things become new, until there shall be

a new heavens and a new earth, to be occupied by the saints of the Most High, all permeated and governed by the law of righteousness.

Each of the great kingdoms, of which we have any knowledge, is pervaded by a life peculiar to itself, by which it is not only organized and governed, but enabled also, in a perfectly free and harmonious way, to accomplish its own peculiar ends. We see this plainly in the kingdom of nature, where we find life in its lowest form spreading throughout every part of this great organism, enabling each part continually to reproduce itself and thus meet and fulfil its own purpose. This is so also in the animal kingdom, where, in connection with the principle of life, we discover the presence of instinct. This is a higher stage of the same principle. It involves the power of self-action and freedom to a certain extent, but still, under a dark and wholly natural form. The same is true, but in a much higher sense, in the human kingdom. Here also is life, life connected with instinct; but, high above all this, is the Godlike principle of reason. Man knows himself in his distinction from and connection with the race, with the world beneath him, and the world above him. He is not only intelligent, but also free; and not only free, but also moral, and hence morally accountable. These principles, connected with that of life, forming the basis on which the human kingdom is organized, give to it a much higher and nobler character than the two lower possess. But higher and nobler still is the kingdom of God. This kingdom is not to be regarded as coming to the human kingdom entirely from abroad, and as being composed of elements and powers wholly foreign to those comprehended in the lower kingdoms. The human kingdom is constituted partly from the earth, the kingdom below it, and partly from the kingdom above it; for God made man of the earth, and breathed into him the breath of life. So, also, is the kingdom of God both human and divine; it comes in and through the human kingdom in the person of Jesus Christ, who is neither wholly divine, nor yet wholly human, but

human and divine. The principle of its organization is the Divine Logos, through the incarnation on the one hand, and the Revelation of God, through inspiration, on the other. Whilst it is, therefore, *His Body*, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, it is also *the ground and pillar of the Truth*, the union of two dispensations, the perpetual bearer of divine life, light and grace for the world under all its other forms. "For in Him" (who now is in His Church) "was *life*, and the life became the *light* of men." This kingdom, linking itself thus vitally with all the lower kingdoms, or rather growing up through them in a truly organic way, bearing within it all the essential elements of human as well as divine life, is designed to raise, complete and sanctify the lower; to connect them with their proper ultimate end, and to communicate to each, in its own measure, the power of attaining this end. Hence the force of the remark made above, that each of these lower kingdoms is true to itself only as it looks to the higher, and all are true to themselves only as they freely take up the life and represent the glory of this highest kingdom, the absolute kingdom of God. Many and daring, indeed, have been the efforts on the part of the unsanctified reason, to separate God, and even the idea of God, from the handiworks which He has framed and continually upholds. "Irreligion has labored in all the branches of science, in the vain hope that the heavens would cease to relate the glories of God, that the earth would disown Him who laid its foundations, and that all nature would give testimony against the Lord who gave it existence and life." But what has all this accomplished! Faithfulness has still continued to characterize the heavens and the earth; and every day, uttering its speech, discovers new confirmations of the fact, that the sciences of every kind find their only foundation in the divinity which permeates nature, and can be developed only as they are true to this normal spiritual life.

The kingdom of God is a fact in the history of the world, subsisting by its own inherent power, independent of all other kingdoms; but other kingdoms are not, in the same

way, independent of it. The spirit can subsist without the body, but the body has no such power independently of the spirit. Without the presence of God's kingdom in and through the kingdoms of the world, as the soul is in and through the body, they must all instantly perish. All life is dependent upon the divine, as this is made to reach earth, in a real way, in the person of Jesus Christ; but the divine is dependent upon nothing beyond itself. The plant, the animal and man, all rest in Christ, and can have no life separated wholly from Him. The very idea of destruction is just such absolute divorce, or sundering from the divine and self-subsisting. Man could not even live in this world without the influence of this heavenly kingdom, much less could he attain to the true end of life, and live happily in the world to come, without an actual submission to it, and a real Christian life in it. For just as the plant cannot grow except it be planted in the ground, just as the animal cannot live outside of and beyond the animal kingdom, and just as man cannot reach the end of his natural life independently of the human race, of which he is an organic part, so neither can he reach the higher destination of his spiritual and immortal nature, unless he become vitally incorporated into and pervaded by the kingdom of divine life and grace.

Now this union with the kingdom of God, so essential to the true condition of man, and through him, to all forms of life and organizations below him, is effected through the ordinances which it carries in its own constitution, for this specific purpose. Holy baptism is the door through which the individual passes really into it, and it into the individual. By water and the Spirit, we are born into the kingdom of God. John 3 : 5, 6. Not by water itself, not by the Spirit itself, but by water and the Spirit, which are mysteriously united in baptism, and essential to constitute baptism. This is our planting into a heavenly soil, our engrafting into the true vine, our new birth in the kingdom of God. And just as the natural child receives its birth, and grows in the constitution of the natural family, and not outside of it, so do we spiritually in this heavenly family. We are nourished

continually through the Holy Supper, the preaching of the Word and the other means of grace. Thus we are represented as going forward in the way of growth, like the child in the natural family, until we shall reach the stature of the perfect man in Christ Jesus.

Now all this is necessary as preceding our proper subject, as the foundation precedes the building, or life, light, if we would come to the true conception of it. For unless there be a real spiritual kingdom, fully and perfectly organized in its own nature, bearing in it real heavenly powers, stretching beyond the individual as such, with a design to come into vital contact with the world, and prepare men for the world to come, there can be no room properly either for *offices* or *officers;* for both these are relative terms, and are designed to represent power and authority lying back of them. If the kingdom of God in the world be regarded as a mere fancy or abstraction, or as an unorganized spiritual influence even, there can, of course, be no room for the idea of office or officer of any kind. There can be no basis of office in a cloud. To look upon the kingdom of God in this light, is the strong tendency of Puritanism throughout. It always divides the Church into two great sections, and calls them the visible and the invisible. As there is no necessary connection between the two in the distinction itself, so neither is there any in this general habit of thought and feeling. The invisible may be separated altogether from the visible, and the former regarded as being in heaven, and the latter only on earth. Such a distinction not only very plainly destroys all real ground of spiritual office, but also the very idea of the Church itself. For what is the visible, when the invisible is thus abstractedly sundered from it? What can its sacraments and offices mean? It is like the human body deserted by the soul—a corpse. Or the invisible may be regarded as being *in* the world, but not necessarily connected with the visible. This helps the case very little, for then it is not organized, nor can it be; and in this unorganized state there can be no basis really either for sacraments or officers. The visible Church, in this form, is hu-

man, and nothing more, and we cannot wonder at the denial of sacramental grace, &c. The only wonder is, that any should feel themselves obligated to enter it at all with a view to cultivate Christian character and a meetness for heaven. Quakerism is the ultimate result, practically, of this habit of thought; and here the very effort is to ignore all visible organization, as far as this may be possible, and to deny visible offices and officers altogether. Everything here is spirit, which comes really into contact with no sort of outward form. This at least has the merit of consistency, for when the spiritual, corresponding to the invisible, is alone regarded as the real, and when this is looked upon by the eye of the mind, as being entirely sundered from the visible and the tangible, what meaning can there be in an outward organization? What force can there be in visible sacraments? or what real basis can be found existing for a living, visible officer? Those who believe in this abstract division of the Church into the visible and invisible, without any kind of bond holding the one to the other, and still persist in maintaining the sacraments, officers, &c., convict themselves at once of the most absurd contradiction. Why adhere to these dead forms at all? There can be no reason arising from the forms themselves, and all the reason that can be assigned, of any character, is the command of God. God has so ordered; ordered, that is, a form without any reason! Sacraments and officers, in this sense, are like dead, sapless branches on the living tree, from which you expect no green leaf, beautiful bud or delicious fruit. To attend upon *such* forms, is formalism indeed! Quakerism, however, has been a complete failure, and Puritanism generally, just in proportion as it develops its own peculiar life and becomes practically consistent, will lose vitality, and fail, to an equal degree, to meet and satisfy the healthy faith and real wants of men. Its ghastly visage can only frighten and repel; it can never draw men permanently to its cold heart, or hold them by its skeleton arms.

All this is simply unnatural. The invisible was not thus sundered from the visible in the person of Jesus Christ.

"He that hath seen me, hath seen the Father." The divine and human natures, without mixture, were one in Christ. Nor are Christians thus separated from their glorious Head. They are bone of His bone, and flesh of His flesh; they are branches in Him as the living vine, and in their persons the visible and the invisible become one. The soul and body are not thus isolated in the living man. He is neither a ghost on the one hand, nor a corpse on the other, but a living union of soul and body. If the soul is to accomplish its legitimate functions in life, it must have a *bona fide* body; it must have feet to walk, hands to handle, eyes to see, ears to hear, and a mouth to speak; and these organs, on the other hand, to be real, and thus truly to accomplish their purposes, must be in living union with the soul. And if analogy is to have any weight, we can very easily perceive how, if the Church is to be a real spiritual existence, the visible and the invisible must be one. Otherwise, there can be no sacraments; for the Spirit alone does not constitute baptism, but Spirit and water; and the thing signified in the Eucharist does not make the Lord's Supper, but this in living connection with bread and wine. (St. John, 6: 53–56.) This real union of the divine and human in the Church, is the only true basis of the officer in her bosom. He is not thus a dead branch on a dead tree, nor yet a dead branch on a living tree, but a living branch, bearing in him visibly as well as invisibly, the life of the living vine. The power and authority which he is ordained to wield and represent, he really does wield and represent, because the visible and the invisible are one. In Plato's *ideal* Republic, there can be no such thing as officer in the *real* sense of the word; but in a real state, you have a real office and a real incumbent in the office. Such is the Church of Him who filleth all in all.

If such now be the realness of the kingdom of God, if all are in it actually who have been baptized and confirmed, what, many ask, will become of those who resist its grace and boldly practice sin? This has been the great difficulty to hundreds of minds; and no doubt it was in view of this

difficulty, or difficulties similar to this, that the distinction has been made, separating the visible from the invisible. It is a very easy matter, standing on this distinction, to answer the question, and say, such persons are in the visible, but not in the invisible Church. But this answer opens another difficulty far worse than the first. It destroys, not only these persons, but all professing Christians, because it destroys the Church itself, which is the only practical means of salvation, and turns the whole heavenly significance of the sacraments into the veriest mockery and sham. Such an answer to the difficulty is fatal. And where is the necessity of it? Why may not such ungodly persons die *in* the Church as well as out of it? Judas died an apostate apostle, and went to *his own* place. Plants die while *in the ground*, as well as when they are rooted out. The tares and wheat grew from the same soil, and by the Saviour it was directed that they should be permitted to remain together until the harvest. And is the act of communing on the part of such unworthy persons an indifferent act? Has such act no significance so far as they themselves are concerned? If they stood only in the visible Church, and the invisible were separated from it, as is pretended, then, of course, their act could have no moral character, for they could not, in this case, come near the spiritual: none, at least, so far as the sacrament itself would be concerned. But is this the way in which the Scriptures speak of the act, its meaning and consequences? Listen to their voice: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation" (*κρίμα*, a *judgment*, a *sentence*, a *condemnation*) "to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." (1 Corinthians, 11: 29.) But the effect is physical as well as moral, thus showing, not only that the Sacrament is real even to the unworthy, but also real for soul and body. "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many sleep." (v. 30). And all this only illustrates the general teaching of Scripture: That the means of grace become one of two things to all—either a "savor of life unto life, or of death unto death." To account, then, for the

presence of wicked persons in the Church of Jesus Christ, and to prepare the way for the proper conviction that they will fall short of the glory of God and lose their souls, it is not necessary to sunder the Church, as it is the custom on the part of many to do, and thus destroy its realness, but simply to say that, like the plant in the earth, though really planted, they die; and the dreadful aggravation of their doom in the world to come (going to their own place), only confirms the reality of the Church for them, as well as the good, from which they have fallen.

The Church is real, because it is the vital union always of the visible and invisible—the body of Christ, the heavenly in the earthly; and this reality is the only basis of office, and the reason why he who fills it is a real *bona fide* officer, bearing in himself, and representing a power above and beyond himself.

The Son of God, rising up in our nature as the Mighty King in this great kingdom, boldly proclaimed Himself as the anointed of the Father to an office involving a threefold function: that of Prophet to instruct, Priest to offer sacrifice, and King to govern; and in His last address to His disciples, He said, conferring this same official character upon them: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo! I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matthew 28: 18, 19, 20.) This constitutes the second grand anointing, by which men, connected with Him and receiving His life, became officially related to the great powers in His kingdom, and qualified to act really in the same glorious functions that inhered in His being. They, too, are anointed to teach: that is, to be prophets; to baptize: that is, to be priests and apply His sacrifice; to secure obedience to His commands: that is, to be kings; and standing in this kingdom, and acting in His name and by His authority, He solemnly engages to be with them alway, even to the end of time.

This is the office, involving a three-fold function, which has descended in all its original integrity and realness to every regularly ordained minister of Jesus Christ, and by its own terms it can never fail to point out definitely to each the respective spheres in which he is called to move and act. In the pulpit and catechetical class, he is a preacher and catechist; at the altar, he is a priest; and among his people, he is a king or pastor, guiding and governing by the principles of wisdom, meekness, gentleness and love. All these functions are centred in, and represented by the bishop. This, properly, is the office of bishop.

The term bishop occurs in three distinctive passages of Scripture. Acts 20: 28: "Take heed, therefore, unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you *overseers* (επισκοπους) to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with His own blood." Philip. 1: 1: "Paul and Timotheus, the servants of Jesus Christ, to all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops (επισκοποις) and deacons." Titus 1: 7: "For a bishop (επισκοπον) must be blameless, as the steward of God; not self-willed, not given to wine, no striker, not given to filthy lucre." The *office of bishop* (ει τις επισκοπης ορεγεται) is referred to in 1 Timothy, 3: 1.; and his character and duties are described at length, from the 2nd to the 8th verses inclusive.

The primary meaning of the word bishop—επισκοπος—derived from the verb επισκοπεω, is one who oversees, an overseer, and in this form the word has been translated in the English Bible, as we have already seen—Acts 20: 26. This word is comprehensive in meaning, and no doubt includes all the minute or particular acts or duties which would naturally fall under or within such general oversight. That he was the supreme officer in the particular church over which he was placed, is clearly proved, from the fact that it was competent for him to discharge, and generally he did really himself discharge, all the official functions in that church. As evidence of the same fact, we find various titles—titles which certainly, in their general width of mean

ing, cover the whole ground, which it was common to give to him. Cyprian has collected and reported six, viz: *Episcopus*, *praepositus*, *pastor*, *gubernator*, *antistes*, *sacerdos*.* His duties consisted generally: 1. In preaching the Word. 2. Praying with and for his people. 3. Administering the two Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. 4. Taking care of the destitute. 5. Ordaining of ministers. 6. Governing his flock. 7. Excommunicating of offenders. 8. Absolving of penitents; and, in brief, whatever duties are properly comprised in preaching, worship, and government, were attended to and discharged by the bishop.

Whether the terms bishop and presbyter are the same in significance, has been a matter of much learned debate, and not a little acrimony of feeling; nor has the controversy yet by any means been generally settled. The full adjustment of this question, as also many others of like general character, must be the result of history, rather than of any argument that might be brought to bear upon it: yet, in the mean time, it is a privilege, and no doubt a duty, also, which each one owes to himself, to examine the subject faithfully and decide intelligently, as far as he may possess the means of so doing.

Different names do not always represent different offices, nor yet different grades in the same office. They often serve rather to describe the manifold nature of the same office, or the different forms in which the same office applies itself to meet the varied wants of our nature in this regard. The ministerial office is, like the sea, known by different names, according to the shore which it washes. The sea is the same. Thus the word *ambassador* is not different officially from the term *pastor*, nor is the word *preacher* different, in the same general sense, from that of *leader* or *governor*. In the same way, it is altogether probable, and, from the evidence which the Scriptures furnish, quite certain, also, that the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* are interchangeable or convertible terms. That presbyters were

* Epist. 69, § 5, p. 208.

not different from bishops *in ordine* is quite clear; for they performed, in their own name and from their own official character, all the acts peculiar to bishops. They confirmed, administered the Sacraments, ordained, and, in a word, did all that bishops did. The difference, according to most writers on this subject, is supposed to lie *in gradu*, or degree, rather than in any inward official right and outward official authority. At the time they bore the name presbyters, they are supposed to have been without a place or parish, and had, therefore, no opportunity, save by the permission of those in regular churches, and therefore called bishops, to exercise the right, *per se*, which they had received in common with them in ordination. But this difference is altogether outward, nominal and circumstantial, and cannot be regarded as amounting to any real difference even in degree; for as soon as the outward circumstances constituting the difference disappeared, they were by that fact on a perfect equality, without any change, increase or diminution whatever, of the inward and real right they had before. As the Church is now constituted, it implies no inferiority in the way of degree, that one minister, regularly ordained, is not permitted to enter the charge of another with a view to perform ministerial acts, without the consent of the installed pastor; nor does it argue a superior degree on the part of the acting pastor, because he has the right to resist such interference, and to direct his fellow-ambassador within the bounds of his own charge. This is a matter of governmental regulation altogether, which lies equally beyond both, as such.

In the early Church, the union, or, as it was very properly called, the college of the different bishops, was designated the presbytery, a name which is clearly of Scripture origin (1 Tim., 4: 14), and the fact that a college of bishops made a presbytery, shows, with demonstrative force, that the different names referred to the same persons, and the same persons in precisely the same office. The fact that one from this number was chosen to preside over the general body (and the historical evidence is, that different

persons were thus chosen periodically, just as in the case of our Synods now, to whom the more emphatic title—*ο επισκοπος—the bishop* was given as a badge of distinction, does not imply that he was different from the rest *in order*, nor yet higher in *rank*, but simply that he was *primus inter pares*.

The Scriptures abound with clear and very decided evidences of *parity* in the ministry, to some of which we will now refer: In the Acts of the Apostles, 20th Chapter and 28th verse, we find the apostle St. Paul addressing *as bishops* the very same persons whom, in the 17th verse, he had called *presbyters*. Here is a plain and direct proof of the fact that the terms were interchangeable—used indifferently to express the same idea. If bishops and presbyters were not identical, this could not have been possible. In Phil. 1: 1, we hear the same apostle saluting the *saints* at Philippi, with the *bishops* and the *deacons*, not even mentioning the presbyters. Where are the presbyters in this case? If they constituted another set of officers, different in order, or even different in degree, in the same order, would not the apostle at least have mentioned them separately and distinctly, as he did the saints, the bishops and the deacons? A salutation is a general form of speech, and the apostle evidently intended to include all in it, and all in their respective positions and functions. How can this be explained otherwise, than on the ground that these different titles—*επισκοπος* and *πρεσβυτερος*—referred to and comprehended the same persons and the same office? In Titus 1: 5, we are informed that Paul left Titus in Crete, now called *Candia*, *Kirid*, or *Kriti*, an island in the Mediterranean, where he established a church, it is probable after his first imprisonment at Rome, for the purpose, among other things, of ordaining *presbyters*; and then, almost immediately after, in verse 7, he describes the qualifications of *bishops*. The circumstance at once suggests the question, What bishops does he here refer to? and the answer is irresistible: To the bishops whom Titus ordained under the name of presbyters. And in the 3d Chapter of 1 Timothy,

from the 2nd to the 8th verses inclusive, the apostle speaks of the character and qualifications of the *bishop*, and then passes directly to the *deacons*, thus irresistibly creating the impression and constraining the inference that, between the bishop and the deacons, there is no other office or officer, and that, if the name bishop is Scriptural, and carries with it a distinctive idea as to character and office, the name presbyter is no less so, and implies the same distinctive idea. The two are fully identical, and the necessary conclusion of the whole Scriptural view is, that each regularly ordained minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ is a bishop, as he is a presbyter, in all the fulness of these divinely inspired terms.

A prudential distinction, not found in Scripture, however, has since been made—first by Calvin, at Geneva, 1537, and afterwards insisted on by many Presbyterian divines, between *teaching* presbyters and *ruling* presbyters. The first are ministers properly, preaching the word and administering the Sacraments, while the second assist in the government and discipline of the Church. This distinction has become general in nearly all the Protestant Churches.

Interesting, however, as the parity of the ministry may be as a point in this discussion, there is still another idea of vastly deeper and more solemn significance. To know that ministers are all equal, is not so important as to perceive clearly *in what* they are equal, and the true power of that in which this equality holds; for what, after all, does equality amount to, if that wherein it lies has no meaning or significance in a practical and real way for our minds? What is equality in office, if the office itself is only nominal, a shadow, and not real! To feel the *reality* of this office is the first and great thing; and for the purpose of preparing the way for this clearly in the mind, as it is prepared in fact, in the Church *per se*, we have already endeavored to unfold, to some extent, the divine and supernatural constitution of the kingdom of God in which it holds. It is altogether vain and foolish, also, to talk in high sounding democratic phrases of office and equality in office, unless,

by the actual presence of the supernatural in the natural, the invisible in the visible, like the soul in the body, we can steadily recognize a real solid ground upon which this office rests. If in our thoughts, the division of these two things be even possible, there can be no real basis of office, no more than there can be a real foundation for a house on sand; but if, in our faith, the Church *is* the actual historical continuation of the vital union of the divine and human, the heavenly and the earthly, effected in the incarnation, then we have a basis of spiritual office which all the powers of earth and even the gates of hell cannot seriously affect; then, too, will the incumbent really possess what he is set forth to represent, and not be the mere sham or hypocrite of pretended power.

Now with this ground at hand, we recognize an *office* in the Church of Christ, and the bishop as an *officer*, in the strict sense of that word. He is called and ordained to act in that office, mediating in Christ's stead between heaven and earth, God and men; and the work which he performs in this capacity, is an official work, and therefore the result of heavenly and divine agencies, and not of the poor, ignorant and carnal powers of man.

We are certainly required, in getting at the true idea of this subject, to make a distinction between a man *as* a *man*, and a man *as* an *officer*, and between his work *as* the *work* of a *man* and *that* of an *officer*. In the one case, we look at the individual man and his work as such; in the other, we look at the officer and his work as such. In the State, and, indeed, in every sphere in which the idea and force of office are really at hand, this distinction is clear and felt by all. It should be no less clearly perceived and practically acknowledged in the Church or kingdom of God. The work which is called a *good work*, in 1 Timothy, 3: 1—*εργον καλον*—is the direct result of activity on the part of the *bishop* as such—*ο επισκοπος*—in and through his *office*.

In office the man does not lose his own personality, individuality, nor yet any of the natural and moral idiosyncracies with which he was created. Even the apostles, in

whom resided, as a permanent grace, the supernatural gift of inspiration, were not by that fact required to eradicate, nor yet to ignore what was peculiar to them naturally as individuals. Christianity does not go upon the principle of revolution, to destroy those peculiar elements in the individual resulting from the first or natural creation, but on the principle of reformation, to elevate, complete and sanctify those elements. It is a new creation in the old, and therefore higher than the old: preserving, on the one hand, all the faculties and powers which are essential to the old, and on the other, destroying and removing out of the way every abnormal obstacle which would cloy or hinder the healthful action of these faculties and powers. The destruction is in order to preservation. Peter still remained the bold rash Peter; between Saul and Paul many clear marks of identity were plainly seen; and the apostle of love no less persistently carried with him, even to the grave, the natural peculiarities which were instamped upon his being, and which, as in the case of all the rest, gave a peculiar type to the religion of his Divine Master. All these natural peculiarities continue in the officer, and also in their active form; but, instead of having, as they had before, an individual significance and character, these are now official. These peculiarities are active, not from the same principle, not in the same sphere, nor yet for the same ends, but through an office, from an authority which was not previously at hand, and towards an end which lay beyond their reach while simply in the sphere of the natural and personal. The activity of these same qualities *out* of office, produces an individual result, but *in* office and *through* office, the result is official, and not individual. Office, and especially divine office, gives character to all the activities of the man as long as he acts in the sphere of his office. This is universally felt, although not so universally perceived and intelligently acknowledged, because the fact which creates the feeling is more easily perceived than the reason of the fact which constrains the intelligent acknowledgment. The threat of punishment on the part

simply of an individual, however meritorious he may be as an individual, may create laughter and derision; but let the same individual appear in the character of a king or magistrate, and utter the same threat, and all will at once feel and perceive the difference.

From this, it is manifest that, as an officer, man is more than a mere individual, with individual rights, powers and authority. He is the embodiment, first, of a more general life, and the representative, second, of a greater and more comprehensive authority. In the State, a mere individual, as such, has neither power to acquit or condemn, nor to confer favor of any kind beyond his own personal ability or influence; his power to benefit or to injure is always bounded by his own narrow individualism; and often, even when in himself he might possess the ability to accomplish much more than he actually does, he finds this ability limited and diminished by a greater opposing power around him. Law is always limiting in this way to wicked power, and even the idea of true freedom and harmony requires the individual, as such, to remain individual, and within the limited sphere of the individual, whatever innate capacity he might have to go beyond this. But as an officer, the power of the individual is much wider, much greater, and on this account, much more an object of admiration or fear. His voice is the voice of the State or nation; his acts are the acts of all combined whom he represents. The suffering of Christ under Pontius Pilate, the Roman Governor of Judea, was a very different thing from what it would have been under any merely private individual. What Pontius Pilate did, or permitted to be done, Judea and the world did or permitted to be done; for the Governor acted from a derived authority connected with his own individual power; and the suffering of Christ, under the circumstances, as the great officer or representative in our nature, we all feel, meant vastly more than if he had done all this simply as an individual, without real connection with our nature. As an officer, the individual has power to punish or reprieve, to confer favor far beyond

his ability simply as an individual, even to take life or preserve it. The very idea of an officer is, one who embodies in his person a life and power broader, deeper and greater than that which naturally belongs to him, and who, in his official acts, represents a will and an authority which no individual, as such, can represent.

It is on this ground that we can account satisfactorily for the rage for office which we witness in every portion of the political world. It gratifies pride by increasing power; in the same proportion does it add dignity and prepare for the consideration of men; it widens the field of wealth and influence, and enables the individual, if he is disposed to fraud, to fill his own coffers as well as those of his friends; and on this account, knowing that, if successful, they can soon restore the sum and increase it ten-fold, persons are willing, in an election campaign, often to spend the last dollar of a large fortune to purchase victory. All power may be abused, and the extent of the abuse, no less than its proper use, shows the increased ability of him who embodies and represents it.

Now this, in a general way, is both the nature of office and the character of the officer, as distinguished from the mere private citizen or individual.

If the Church now be a real organization, such as we have already seen it to be; if there are actual powers in it greater and wider than the individual as such, then this same official character must also, by necessity, exist in it—only, of course, in a still deeper sense and a more substantial form, for here we come to the very root of all power and authority. The Church, in this respect, is plainly the prototype of the State; its solid basis and pervading life, as all authority lodges at last in God, and reaches the world really only through His kingdom: for in what other way could it by any possibility reach the world? Kings reign and governors rule only on the ground of divine authority; and history confirms the truth that, as a matter of fact, their power passes from them just as they pass from this recognized basis—the authority of God. What right has

one man, as such, to rule another? and what right have men, as such, in the same general way, to rule others? Man, either as an individual or even as an officer, can have no authority irrespective of God. Obedience to a ruler can be claimed only in so far as he can make out a divine right to rule. Otherwise, his government, however mild and gentle, would be the vilest tyranny, and rebellion would be the necessary and natural result of the sense of simple duty. All this is attested practically by the idea of oath, which is the last and deepest ground of authority—appealing to God. All right, in this regard, comes from God, through His kingdom, and if the kingdom of God gives reality to the State—gives it its only true basis of authority—it must be more real than the State; and by the same inferential process, we conclude that its officer must be invested with a far greater and more solemn authority than that possessed by any in the kingdoms of the world, before whom men crouch and tremble. If, therefore, we are commanded to be subject to the higher civil powers, on the ground that these are ordained of God, and that resistance involves condemnation (Rom. 13: 1–7), how much greater must be the same obligation in reference to the spiritual power on which the civil rests, and how much more dreadful the damnation in case of wilful disobedience! In the comparison instituted between Moses and Jesus Christ, St. Paul clearly brings out the idea.—Heb. 10: 28, 29, &c.

As an officer in the Church, the minister stands in the midst of a life and grace, which are deeper and far more comprehensive than the life and grace which attach simply to his own individual and pious character, just as in the case of an official standing in the State. He is, in this view, properly more than himself—the embodiment of powers beyond him, and the representative of an authority which it would be impious and wicked even to claim as a mere individual. He stands in *Christ's stead* (2 Cor., 5: 20), speaking and acting in His place and name; or, to change the order, it is Christ acting and speaking through him as His representative, just as the State speaks and acts through him whom

it calls to be its organ. This idea is brought out distinctly in the verbal form of the word from which his name is derived (πρεσβευω), not only to be a *senior*, an *elder*, but also an *ambassador*, or *deputy;* to go and act as a deputy or ambassador; to make treaties and ratify contracts, all in the name and by the authority of those whom he represents; and in all this, the first sense and the last sense, viz., elder and deputy, there is no inconsistency. These names do not exclude each other, but belong to and unite in the same persons; for all who are familiar with the character of ancient and grave assemblies, from which we learn the *usus loquendi* in this case—such, for instance, as the Sanhedrim at Jerusalem, composed of seventy Judges or Senators —will know that the invariable habit was to select aged, experienced and venerable men, as ambassadors or deputies. In Matthew 16: 21, they are called elders (πρεσβυτεροι). Hence the Gospel which the individual proclaims, as ambassador or deputy, is not his own; it is a divine message which has been received by him; and, without adding anything to it of his own invention, or taking from it anything of its own inspired majesty and glory, he is simply required to proclaim it, just as it is, as the Word of God, and not of man. Thus St. Paul preached; not with enticing words, not with the trappings and tricks of carnal rhetoric, not in the wisdom of human philosophy, nor yet with the soiled beauties of proud poetry, but in the simplicity of inspiration, and with the demonstration and power of the Holy Ghost; and his words, passing through the ear, were like two-edged swords, cutting to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, proving discerners of the thoughts and purposes of the heart. And in listening to the minister speaking thus the words of God from his high office, we do not listen to him as an individual, but as an officer; for, just as in civil matters, the individual is lost sight of in the ruler, in the representative of laws and powers which lie back of and beyond his own person, so also does the eye of faith close in regard to the person of the minister, and open upon nothing but the officer in Christ's stead. His words

and acts thus separated from the weakness and ignorance which attach to the human, become at once clothed with the power and wisdom of God, and it is this wisdom and power of God which effect the salvation of the soul.

When he stands at the baptismal font and dedicates the child or adult to God, saying: "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost," he acts not as an individual, but as an officer—an organ—established by the ordaining power of Christ, through whom God communicates the grace of regeneration which is peculiar to the official act. This is baptism; but baptism of water only is no baptism. Baptism is the sacrament mystically uniting in itself both the water and the Spirit. Unbelief may ask, as it always has asked, without making the law of God or the law of Sacraments without effect, what can be the inward significance of that act and those words in the case of the subject? Would such ask the same question, were a competent civil officer to approach the bound criminal condemned to die, whether infant or adult, and, striking off the manacles, should say, your crime is pardoned—you are free? What meaning can there be in the act and words of a single man in reference to those whom the whole law of the land has condemned! But we must not forget that this single man is an officer, and as such, represents in his person the whole power of the law which had condemned. It is not *he*, in his private person, that pardons and sets free, but the State through him. A proper officer, properly commissioned, may, by a single tap of his finger on the oceanic telegraph, send through the deep sea a word which would cause all Europe to tremble. Why? Certainly not because of any great power to harm attaching to him as an individual, but because of the national power lying back of him, which he represents. The power to liberate from the curse of sin and to regenerate the heart of man, thus setting him free, comes not, in the act of Holy Baptism, from the individual who officiates, but from God, through the office and officer which are in His kingdom for this very purpose.

When Peter said to the cripple crouching in his physical helplessness at the gate of the temple called Beautiful, "Such as I have give I thee; in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth rise up and walk," he spake not in his private capacity, as is shown by the language itself, but as an officer of a kingdom replete with heavenly powers at every point; and when, immediately after, the feet and ankle-bones of the cripple received strength, so that leaping up, he stood, and walked, and entered with him and John into the temple, walking and leaping. The agency of his cure, though it came through Peter, was so manifest, that he did not turn and give glory to Peter, but praised God directly; and when the people, hearing of the miracle, ran together greatly wondering and ready to worship the apostles, Peter rose up and corrected their mistake in these words: "Ye men of Israel, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye so earnestly on us, as though by our power or holiness we had made this man to walk?" The power, he said, did not reside in them, but in Jesus Christ, and was applied through them only as organs. Thus God always operates by means, through His ministers in their office, that it may be apparent to all that the power is from God, and that the glory should be ascribed to God alone. But whilst we dare not lose sight of the fact that God alone is the source of all regenerating grace, we are just as little allowed to lose sight of the means or organs through which this grace is to be conveyed and applied. Both are essential; and although they are so on different grounds and for different reasons, this does not change or alter the fact relatively to men in the least degree; for whether you have the converting grace without the means of its application, or have the means of its application, and not the grace itself, the result is the same—man remains in a state of sin and death. This should teach us the important truth, that we cannot magnify the grace of God by undervaluing the means of its conveyance; but on the other hand, just as we put proper honor upon the last will we magnify the first. Both are divine and equally necessary.

Sometimes it is supposed by those who, in other respects, think and reason very correctly, that this official character is calculated to give prominence to the individual or personal, as such, and becomes the basis of pride, vanity and self-conceit. This might *appear* so, and just for this reason we are to be careful not to put into office such as are influenced more by appearance than by the real truth of the case. "Lay hands suddenly on no man." "Not a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil." (1 Tim., 3: 6.) When the subject is looked at candidly, however, it will be found that this high official position tends powerfully, with all properly balanced minds, in the very opposite direction, to induce humility and self-abasement. For when has an individual occasion for pride and vain glory? When he can feel that the effect produced is the result of his own personal powers? or when, through himself as a simple organ, he is bound to trace it all to God in Jesus Christ? In the former case, he is both the fancied ground, cause and means; and when the effect is produced, the language of the heart is (and you can not but see it printed, often even stereotyped, in the countenance and in every motion of the body), "Behold, what I have done!" whilst in the other case, he is only a means, and in the spirit of Peter and John, you will hear him saying: "Look not upon me as though I had done it—I am but the voice of one crying, give God the glory," which should be the greater because of the unworthiness of the instrument by which he has accomplished such glorious things. Official power is not that which grows out of a man's own being, and therefore to be called his own, but it is delegated; and when a man glories in delegated power, he overlooks self to that extent, and prides in that which lies beyond him. If the case be that of the minister, and this delegated power be from Christ, then he glories in Christ and not in himself; and this was just the spirit of St. Paul: "I magnify mine office;" "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Jesus Christ." These two things for

him were the same, and they are the same for all who, like him, would truly glorify their great Master and deny themselves. This strictly official character and position is then not only the medium and ground also in a certain sense of true saving power, but likewise the only basis of true humility, and this illustrates a general truism, which, in turn, establishes the principle here advanced, that genuine greatness and genuine humility are always found together—are, in fact, only different aspects of the same thing.

When the ambassador of Jesus Christ, in conjunction with other presbyters, lays his hands upon men in ordination, and they receive, in that act, a *gift*—χαρις—or χαρισμα—*grace* or *favor*—(1 Tim., 4: 14, 2 Tim., 1: 6), which will enable them in turn to wield a similar power beyond themselves and the world, as such, he acts again, not from any sense of personal strength, but as an officer, in the name and strength of Jesus Christ. The divine gift here imimparted comes not from the fingers of the presbyters, as has been sneeringly insinuated by those who choose not to accept the simple truth of God, but from Christ through them as the channel which He has appointed. He speaks in the same official character when, at the close of the service, he says: "Grace, mercy, and peace, &c., *be unto you*;" or rather, it is Christ Himself—always in the Church for this purpose—speaking these words authoritatively through the deputy, he standing in Christ's stead.

As an officer, the minister, bishop or presbyter (for we take these terms to be interchangeable), acts not *from* nor *for* himself in any sense, but *from* and *for* Christ wholly. He represents not his own person or authority, but the person and authority of his great Master; and the power which he thus brings to bear upon men is not his, but the power of Him from and for whom he acts. In the great commission given to the apostles, and descending by necessity to all subsequent bishops, enabling *them* thus to fulfil its terms, to "go into all the world and preach the Gospel," the Saviour Himself taught this deep and solemn doctrine in the most forcible manner. He said: "All power is given

unto me in heaven and in earth," and then, turning directly to His disciples, He said, "Go ye, therefore," and make disciples through your official acts, by baptism, by teaching and securing practical obedience to my commands; and then to encourage them still more, He engaged to be with them in all the fulness of the power of which He had spoken, even unto the end of the world.

This passage is indeed wonderful; and it will strike the mind still more forcibly, if, by a slight transposition, we bring the main points more closely together. Thus: "All power in heaven and in earth is given unto *me*—*Go* YE THEREFORE." Does this not clearly imply that this power is given to them in their office and all their successors? and does not the pledge which He made, *to be with them alway*, increase the certainty of this inference, as if He had said—My power is your qualification; therefore, Go. Who will then dare to say, in view of such actually present resources and powers, that the office of bishop is only nominal, that he is merely a private person after all, and that his power to affect men is measured by the natural strength of his own mind, or the physical compass of his voice!

Of the same general import is the language of the Saviour uttered on another occasion: "He that heareth *you*, heareth *me*; and he that despiseth *you*, despiseth *me*; and he that despiseth *me*, despiseth *Him* that sent me." (Luke 10: 16.) Here is a perfect chain of authority, extending from the Father, through the Son, to the ambassadors whom He appoints, and it is clearly affirmed that, to hear the last is to hear the second and the first, and to despise the last is also to despise the second and the first. Could any language, teaching official identity, be stronger or more explicit? Does not the minister of the Gospel, therefore, possess spiritual authority, dignity and power beyond his own bare narrow individual person? Truly, in view of such plain teaching, the meaning or sense of which standing patent upon the very words themselves, it is more difficult to disbelieve than believe.

This official authority constitutes, at the same time, the

only proper ground of *discipline*, which is one of the first features in the character of the minister of Christ. His duty is not only to preach the Word, administer the Sacraments and conduct the worship in a general way, but he must also *oversee*, govern and rule among his people. He is to guard doctrine and morals; and when any depart from the plain standard of truth and duty, and become heretical in sentiment or corrupt in manners, it is his duty to warn, admonish, suspend and excommunicate. But alas, how this duty has been lost sight of in these latter days! Why is this? Not surely because there is no such authority in the Church, but because there is no proper *realization* of this authority. Is it not a fact that elders now in the Church—set up definitely as *ruling elders*—regard themselves as being teased or made sport of when you call them officers? Their official character does not seem to impress them deeply that they possess authority from Christ, as office-bearers in His Church, to attend to this work; and hence they make no point whatever of impressing the same idea upon others. Are they regarded as officers really by the community? Does even the congregation itself, in its heart, believe that they have authority from Christ to rule over it, correct it, and guide it? Would this faith be sufficiently earnest and strong to lead the congregation to submit quietly and peaceably to any real practical attempt of this character? In our estimatiou, judging from the practical pass to which things in the Christian Church in regard to discipline are coming, it remains yet a question as to whether the work of Calvin, in dividing ordained men into ruling and teaching elders, was a prudent work. Besides the injury sustained by the quiet giving up, in a practical way, of true official character on the part of ruling elders themselves, it has had a most disastrous influence upon the official character and standing of the teaching elders. Nothing has served so much to close the eye of the world against the office, as such, of the minister. And the world reasons consistently in regard to this matter. If ruling elders are ordained, and they give up practically the idea

of being officers really in the kingdom of Christ, how can ministers properly claim this high office, since they, also, are ordained in the same way?

Still the idea, duty and authority of discipline remain, and the more deeply we study the idea, and earnestly believe in the authority, the more faithfully will we discharge the duty. To those whom *Christ* made office-bearers, He said, through Peter to all the rest: "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." (Matthew 16: 19.) What sublime language is this! But where is it practically believed? The same language was substantially repeated, to impress, no doubt, its grand truth more indelibly upon the mind (for its very grandeur constituted a difficulty in the case of the carnal mind to receive and rest upon it), when the disciples, for fear of the Jews, were assembled in the upper room in Jerusalem: "Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. * * Receive the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained."

The minister of Jesus Christ is officially the representative of divine and heavenly powers—powers not only on earth, but also in heaven; for *all* power, both in heaven and in earth, was given to Christ, which, according to the most manifest meaning of plain words, He communicates and applies through His ambassadors in their office. This now, purely in the light of Scripture, and mainly in the words of Christ Himself, is the deep meaning and solemn nature of the ministerial office. It stands organically related to spiritual and supernatural realities; and the minister in this office, whether men believe it or not, in his acts, applies those realities, and in every case they result in one of two things, "either in a savor of life unto life, or a savor of death unto death."

From all this we can readily see the great power of the minister for good. St. Paul styles his activity in this di-

vinely official department, by way of emphasis, a *good work*, —*pulchrum opus—beautiful* (the beautiful is always one of the fundamental elements of the good and heavenly), *excellent*, *magnificent*, *glorious*. It is not meant here that it is a good work in the ordinary sense of the word, such as kindness which a natural man may show to another, or such as charitable bequests or personal energy or prayers, which ordinary Christians may exhibit, nor yet any effort which the minister himself may make in his individual unofficial character. All this is good in its kind; even a cup of cold water, given to a disciple in the same way, has its reward, but this official work is good in a sense far above and beyond all these personal efforts and activities. What prayers, and charities, and zeal on the part of thousands were equivalent to the simple act of baptism, by one regular ambassador of Christ? to the official communication of the Word of God? to the administration of the Holy Supper? and to the legitimate and authoritative government of the Church of Christ? Could any amount of private effort be regarded as a legitimate and proper substitute for these simple, official acts? Certainly we cannot think so, until it is shown, at least, that *quantity*, when it reaches a certain high point, loses its own proper character as quantity, and becomes *quality*. The work is different in *kind*—a gracious work in a peculiar sense, proceeding directly from Christ through the minister as His deputy. It is emphatically an *official* work, which is the distinctive idea brought out in full by the apostle in 1 Tim., 3: 1, where he makes use of the genitive of origin—*καλου εργου επιθυμει—desires an office of good work*, plainly making the office the immediate source and exclusive channel. Otherwise we cannot understand why personal prayer, subjective repentance and faith, involving a certain kind of experience, acts of charity and outward engagedness generally, in the bald style of the Quaker, may not be a sufficient substitute for the above mentioned acts. We never can get rid of the fact which stands out so prominently in every portion of the Bible, and in every section of the history of the Church, *that all*

true religion is sacramental. We may fight against it, and sometimes think that we have banished the idea forever, but often, before we are aware of it, it will be back again in all the freshness of its ever youthful vigor, and constrain the homage of our truthful nature. Truth carries in its own nature the power of self-authentication to the really earnest mind. In its simplest form, it is the most beautiful and winning to the truth-loving spirit. Error, adorned in its most gaudy trappings, is error still, and though, during the moment of excitement, it may reign triumphant, the first return of cool reflection will show its tyranny, dissolve its empire and expose its deformity. "Truth resembles a woman of real beauty, who, conscious of her charms, despises the affectation of ornament; error, on the contrary, paints and ornaments herself, because she is ugly, without expression, without grace, without dignity," and all that is necessary to break her spell is, to wash away her paint and disrobe her of the tinsel with which the imagination has adorned her. The earnest mind can never be satisfied with the religion of the carnal fancy, however charmingly, for the moment, it may be painted before the mind; as soon as the apparition has fled, it will again inquire for the *real*, for that which comes from Christ through the Sacraments which He Himself has ordained. This truth, having the nature of self-authentication, has also the power of self-existence; it is objective, and no amount of cultivated error, on the part of men, with only the outward garments of truth and beauty, can ever destroy it. We need not wonder, therefore, why it is so difficult to get rid of this conviction; the power of God is the pavilion round about it.

It is not only a distinctively good work, but also a distinctively *great* work. It is greater than any which individuals, or even the world combined, could do in and from itself. Its only measure is the power of God in Christ. To what other class of men has it ever been said: "He that heareth you, heareth me?" and, "whatsoever ye bind on earth shall be bound in heaven?" To what other class has Christ, to whom all power was given, become so com-

pletely identified, that their words and acts are to be regarded, really and truly, as His words and acts? Wonderful as it may strike the mind, yet this is the office of the bishop; in one sense, he is a man of like infirmities with ourselves, but in another, he is the ambassador of the King of kings and Lord of lords. We have this power in earthen vessels, in order that it may be made manifest, and that the glory of it is from God.

But all this, as we may readily see, depends for us again upon what we conceive to be the true nature of the Church itself. If we can keep the conviction steadily before the mind, that the Church is the continual incarnate presence of Jesus Christ, His own glorious body, and therefore, the bearer and sphere of divine and heavenly realities, we shall have no difficulty in perceiving and feeling the solemn realness of the minister as an officer, and the power of his acts. But if, on this point, we have doubt and difficulty, we shall certainly make shipwreck of all these divine and glorious verities.

As the distinction of visible and invisible in the Puritan mind has sundered the spiritual from the human, and the heavenly from the earthly, and has thus destroyed, in our faith, the real ground for the idea of office in the strict sense of the word, so has it also separated the idea of salvation from the Church altogether. Christ is no longer in the temple proper, in the Holy of Holies, between the cherubim, Himself the glorious Shekinah, but is driven out into the outer court, into the world, no one can tell *where* exactly; and now men, sent adrift after a floating barque or a changing shadow, are directed, lo! here, and lo! there, for the good they crave. This unchurchly temper and habit, growing out of the above unfortunate and rationalistic distinction, is the origin of the whole system of religion, or pretended religion, outside of the Church. And certainly the system lacks no essential feature of consistency; for the visible Church, separated from the invisible, must of course be a human contrivance; and in a human contrivance, what ground can there be for office really, for spiritual and

heavenly purposes? We could see some propriety, even in a human organization, even in a temperance society, for personal, private effort, &c., but as for any basis of divine *office*, a spiritual and representative idea purely, we can form no conception at all. And the idea of an official communication of grace, or the new birth, being thus rationalistically ruled out of the Church, it is altogether consistent that those, thus believing, should turn their backs upon the real Shekinah, and seek to find that at the "Anxious Bench," or in some other equally *ab extra* sphere or means, in the outer court or world, which is to be found alone truly in the Holy of Holies. These two systems are directly opposed to each other; there is no such thing as a compromise to be effected between them. If Christ is in the Church, and if He imparts Himself through the Sacraments and the ministry, then the outside scheme falls at once to the ground and is unnecessary; if, on the other hand, He is found really and truly outside of the Church and independently of the Sacraments and the ministry officially considered, then there can be no real necessity for the Church, and the office of the ministry becomes the veriest figment and sham. The question comes right down to this issue: Shall we have a Church, or shall we have no Church? It is not difficult to tell on what side the true Christian stands on this issue.

From the whole subject, we can easily see how the minister should regard himself and his work under the solemnities of his ordination. He should never forget that he is an officer, as really and truly as he is an individual, and that his acts as such are significant, both for time and eternity. With St. Paul, he should ever say: "I magnify mine office."

With equal ease can we understand how the people should regard the ambassador of Christ. They should not esteem him simply as a learned man, as a refined social companion, or as an eloquent and able declaimer, but beyond and above all, as an officer in Christ's stead, to mediate between them and God. It is for his *official work's sake* that they

should regard him highly, and for his faithfulness in this work, they are commanded to esteem him as *worthy of double honor*.

Very easily, also, in the light of this whole subject, can we see the sad mistake of those who are led to give up this official work in favor of that which is wholly personal and individual, such as colportage, school teaching, &c. The fancy that they can be more useful, depending upon their own powers, than upon the power of Christ through them, is vain and sinful.

No subject, finally, should have power to appeal more strongly to the young men in the Church in reference to the duty of consecrating themselves to God in the holy ministry. In what other department can they reach a higher office? From whence can they come into possession of greater real power? In what sphere can they exert a more commanding and moulding influence? If ambition is here appealed to, it is a high and holy ambition; it has regard to a good, a magnificent, a glorious work—a work, the effect of which will be experienced when all the splendid productions of genius, whether in art, science, philosophy, or government, like the beautiful flowers in autumn, shall have faded, withered and died forever.

Harrisburg, Pa. D. G.

ART. VI.—THE PALATINATE: *A Historico-Geographical Sketch.*

Among the states that formed part of the German empire, the Palatinate became celebrated by the fertility of its soil and the active industry of its inhabitants. Though of small extent, when compared to other more powerful principalities, and having its territories scattered in separate parts among intervenient states, it nevertheless sustained its rank as the first of the secular electorates, and exercised an important influence on the political vicissitudes of Germany during the Reformation. The Palatinate, by its situation on the frontiers of Lorraine, formed the bulwark of the empire against France, and became repeatedly exposed to devastating invasions during the wars of the seventeenth century. Yet it slowly recovered from those disasters, and is at the present day one of the wealthiest and most productive provinces of the German Confederacy.

From the times of the middle ages until the outbreak of the thirty years war in 1620, it consisted of two separate provinces—the Upper and Lower Palatinate. The former, the *Oberpfalz* or the Palatinate of Bavaria, was composed of the eastern parts of the medieval province of the *Nordgau*, formerly belonging to the feudal dominions of the imperial dynasty of the Hohenstaufen, which became alienated on the death of Conradin of Swabia, the last descendant of that family, in 1268.

It was bounded on the north by Bayreuth; on the west by the territory of Nürnberg and part of Swabia; on the south by Bavaria, and on the east by Bohemia, from which it was separated by the Hercynian range or *Böhmerwald.* Its valleys, sloping down toward the large Frankonian plain, are irrigated by numerous rivers that descend in various directions from the Bohemian Range; of these, the

Maine runs in northwestern direction toward the Rhine, the Nab and Regen turn southward and fall in the Danube. It is very hilly, and was formerly considered as a barren country, whose chief wealth consisted in forests and pastures; its iron mines were productive, and the silver mines of Amberg afforded the elector a yearly revenue of 60,000 crowns, yet it did not raise sufficient corn for the consumption of the inhabitants. Since the union with Bavaria, it forms part of the two circles of the Upper Maine and the Regen, and is in a high state of cultivation and improvement. In 1807 its area was 2,730 square miles, with a population of 284,000 souls.

When the traveler descends from the Bohemian mountains into the valleys of the Palatinate, he feels delighted at the rich variety of the scenery, the neat towns and villages embosomed in what appears to him to be vineyards, but in reality proves to be immense plantations of *hops*, and when he arrives at the frontier station of Mähring, the red bloated faces of the Bavarian gendarmes and custom-officers, who cunningly scrutinize his passports and baggage, give him the fullest evidence that he has arrived in the homestead of the *bock*. The Oberpfälzers are a tall, stout and active people, who make a pleasant impression when compared to their wretched neighbors, the Bohemians. Their dark, expressive eye, black hair and moustache, the round velvet jacket and steeple-crowned hat, adorned with a nosegay, presents the appearance of Tyrolians, while their neatly dressed women offer the hospitality of the cottage in that hearty, broad dialect, which at once reminds you that you are a welcome guest in bonny Bavaria. The ancient Oberpfalz was divided into bailiwics (*ämter*), and enclosed several seigniories and counties—such as those of Murdach and Cham, on the Bohemian frontier, and the Landgraviate of Leuchtenberg, which in our day was given as a duchy to the stepson of Napoleon I, Eugene Beauharnais, by the king of Bavaria. Amberg, on the river Vils, celebrated by its iron mines, was the capitol of Oberfalz, though the electors during their visits generally re-

sided at the neighboring monastery of Castel. Neuburg, on the river Schwarzach, gave title to the second branch of the Palatine House, the counts of Pfalz-Neuburg, who in 1609 became dukes of Gülich-Cleve-Berg on the Rhine, and started the first hostilities between the Reformed and Catholic Confederacies. Other thriving cities were Auerbach, Tirschenreut, Neustadt and Nabburg. In the castle of Trausnitz, near Leuchtenberg, the archduke Frederic, the Handsome, was imprisoned after the battle of Ampfinzen in 1322, and there he became reconciled to the generous emperor, Lewis the Bavarian.

Different was the character of the smaller but more important province, the Lower Palatinate (*Unterpfalz*). It was also called the Electoral Palatinate (*Churpfalz*), or the Palatinate on the Rhine (*Pfalz am Rheine, or Rheinpfalz,*) and was situated on both banks of the Rhine. The area of Rheinpfalz Proper was about 1600 square miles, with a population above 300,000 souls, and extended from the Odenwald on the east, across the Rhine to the western slope of the Vosges in Lorraine. It was bounded on the north by the electorate of Treves and the county of Katzenelnbogen, on the east by the electorate of Mayence and the duchy of Würtemberg, on the south by the margraviate of Baden and Alsace, and on the east by the duchy of Lorraine. Its frontiers had no regular outline, several of its domains being situated within the neighboring territories or on the Upper Rhine, while it enclosed within its own limits the bishoprics of Worms and Spire, belonging to the electorate of Mayence and the independent seigniories of Reipholzkirchen, Munchweiler and others.

Churpfalz was divided into eight bailiwics (*Oberämter*), five of which lay on the eastern bank of the Rhine. These were Heidelberg, on the Neckar, Ladenburg, between Neckar and Rhine, Lindenfels among the hills of the Odenwald, Mosbach, with the district of Bretten, on the eastern border, and Boxberg, inclosed in the electorate of Mayence.

The other three bailiwics on the western banks of the Rhine, were Alzey, with the counties and seigniorories of

Leiningen, Frankenstein, Kirchheim, Arnheim and others; Kaiserlautern, southward, with the seigniory of Landstuhl; and Germersheim on the Rhine.

On the southwest of the Palatinate was situated the county and afterwards duchy of Zweibrücken, which in 1390 became the patrimony and title of a younger house of the Counts Palatine. These princes were by the Latin writers of that age called *Principes Bipontani*, and by the French, princes of *Deuxponts*. It was divided into five bailiwics: Zweibrücken, Bergzab, Gutenberg, Lichtenberg, and Selz, the latter on the Rhine in Alsace. Enclosed in the electorate of Treves lay the county of Veldenz on the banks of the Moselle, and on the north the principality of Simmern, with the bailiwics of Stromberg, Ingelheim, and Biberach on the right bank of the Rhine. Between these provinces lay the county of Sponheim.

The older residence of the electors was Heidelberg on the left bank of the Neckar. Its situation is one of the most picturesque in Germany, and its marble palace, on the hill above the city, was the admiration of the world, until it was ruthlessly despoiled and burnt by the French marauders in 1689. The celebrated Library of the University of Heidelberg had already had a similar fate in 1622, when Count Tilly, the general of the Catholic league, expelled the professors and students, and sent some three thousand of its precious manuscripts as a present to Pope Gregory XV., in Rome.

At the union of the Neckar with the Rhine, emigrants from the Netherlands built in 1606 the city of Manheim, which, though plundered by the Spaniards in 1622, and totally destroyed by the French in 1688, was rebuilt by the elector Frederic William in 1699, and became in 1720 the residence of Charles Philipp and his successors, and the most beautiful and thriving city in the Palatinate. The monastery Frankenthal, opposite to Manheim, on the left bank of the Rhine, was turned into a fortress by the Hollanders, who from its battlements heroically repelled the attacks of General Cordova and his Spaniards in 1622.

Other pleasant cities on the banks of the Rhine, were

Biberack, celebrated for its wines; Caub, in the Rhinegau, near the castle of Pfalz, the earliest seat of the Counts Palatine, and Ingelheim, the favorite residence of Charlemagne. At Germersheim died Rudolph of Habsburg, in 1293, and on the plain of Göllheim, at the base of the Donnersberg, his son, Albrecht of Austria, won the bloody diadem against Adolph of Nassau, who fell in the battle in 1298. The strong castle of Trives, in the high range of the Vosges, west of Landau, was the prison of Richard the Lion-hearted, on his return from the crusade in 1193, and at the fortress of Landstuhl, between Zweibrüken and Kaiserslautern, fell the last knight of feudal Germany, Francis of Sickingen, in 1523, in his vain attempt to defend his rocky strong-hold against the regular army and newly invented artillery of his sovereign.

The valleys of the Rhine, Neckar and Nahe, and the fertile slopes of the Vosges, of which the highest summit, the Donnersburg, has an elevation of twenty thousand and eighty-eight feet, are well cultivated, and present the most charming views to the traveller, by the picturesque variety of forest-clad mountains, everywhere crowned with the ruins of medieval fortresses, and sloping vineyards or luxuriant plains, intersected by rivulets or canals, and dotted with numerous towns and villages. The wines of Ingelheim, Neustadt, Türkheim, Kreuznach, Oppenheim and Selz are among the best and most abundant of Germany. The almond, the chestnut, and various fruit trees; all kinds of grain, hemp, flax, and the most useful plants, grow here luxuriantly, and diffuse wealth and plenty over the land. It is particularly on the celebrated *Bergstrasse*, or mountain road leading from Frankfurt to Heidelberg, that the traveller discovers the remarkable difference in manners and superior cultivation of the Rheinpfälzers, when compared to the Bavarian Oberpfälzers or to the other German states north of the Maine. The beautiful high road, shaded by rows of fruit trees, runs along the base of the Odenwald range, through an almost uninterrupted succession of towns, villages and country seats; the white washed

cottages, with their painted frame-work, look out from the vineyards, where men and women in their quaint old fashioned costumes, are working and singing merrily; all has an air of rural simplicity and domestic comfort. I remember that when on a pedestrian journey through the Palatinate in the summer of 1834, I wandered with delight beneath the shady alleys of fruit-trees, whose boughs were hanging heavily down under the load of ripening apples, pears, bergamots, plums, or walnuts, the passing Pfälzers would good humoredly tell me that the traveller was allowed to eat as much of the fruits as he pleased, while on the road, but that he was prohibited from carrying anything along with him.

"There are within the Palatinate," says an old traveller from 1677, "twenty-four walled cities and twelve fair palaces of the Prince Elector, most of which they have added to their estates within these four hundred years. Such excellent managers have they been of their own domains, so potent in ordering the affairs of the State both in war and peace, and so engrafted themselves into the most notable families of Germany, that I may well say with Irenius: 'Non est alia Germaniæ familia cui plus debeat nobilitas.'"

The early history of the Palatinate is obscure. But it may perhaps not be uninteresting to follow its traces back to the first establishment of the Frankish Empire. Among the high officers at the court of the Merovingian kings, was the *Comes Palatii*, or Count of the Palace,* who held the supreme judicial authority as lieutenant of the king, and presided in the court during his absence, in the same manner as the *Mayor Domus*, who, as chancellor, superintended the royal household and as a general commanded the feudal army.† But in the course of time, when the Frankish

* Palatium, first signifying one of the seven hills of Rome, was afterwards used by Ovid for *Domus Augusti*, which was built on it and then for every palace; hence the medieval German *Pfalz* or *Pfalenz* for the Imperial residence, castle, or court of justice and the compounds of *Churfalz*, *Rheinfalz*, &c.

† Sismondi in his History of the French gives a somewhat different function to the *mayor domus*. He supposes the mayor of the palace to have been, not an officer of the court, but a popular magistrate, called in German *Mord-Dom*, the justice of murder, who was elected by the people for the protection

empire continued to extend, the jurisdiction of this high functionary became necessary in the more distant territories. The king would, therefore, grant to the holder of a certain fief or province the right to exercise the same power and jurisdiction within his territory as the comes palatii exercised in the capital. Hence this feudatory also obtained the name of comes palatii, or palatinus (*Pfalzgraf*) and by virtue of this royal favor he enjoyed within his province a supreme and particular jurisdiction, having the *jura imperii* or royalties, by which he was distinguished from the ordinary comes (*Graf*) who had only an inferior and dependent authority within his county.* This was the origin of the distinction between the Pfalzgraf and Graf (or *Margraf*, border-count and *Landgraf*, count of several united districts) in Germany, and we thus find early counts palatine in Franconia, Bavaria, Swabia, Burgundy and later in Saxony.

Aix-la-Chapelle (Achen) being the principal residence (*Haupt-Pfalz*) of Charlemagne, this city was the seat of the imperial count palatine. But at the subsequent dismemberment of the Carlovingian empire, the court of this high judge was removed to the Rhine, where he held the jurisdiction over a province which, as an imperial domain, depended directly on the crown. It was at that period (between 843 and 912) that the feudal system developed its full strength, and the royal power was wrenched from the hand of the weak successors of Charlemagne by the haughty feudatories of the provinces. These began to arrogate to themselves the ducal dignity, which they soon made hereditary in their families, and they possessed themselves of the revenues of those crown-lands they held as a reward for their service. In like manner the dukes usurped

of the freemen. The important point, however, is that the mayor domus soon became chancellor, and directed the distribution of fiefs, (*beneficia*) among the warriors, and by their favor gaining influence, at last ascended the throne. See the works of Sismondi, Michelet, Leo and Eichhorn.

* According to this custom in England too, the counts palatine had jura regalia within their counties, subject only to the king's general superiority as sovereign. Thus the dukes of Lancaster and the earls of Chester held that title and Penbroke in Wales was also formerly a county palatine.

the jurisdiction of the counts palatine, and henceforth that title did no longer represent the royal authority.

Only the Count Palatine of the Rhine, then residing at Worms, being dependant on no duke, continued to sustain the royal dignity in his territory and rose to such power and influence that, at the institution of the electors in 1256, on the downfall of the Hohen-staufen dynasty, he obtained the first rank among the secular princes and the high function of arch-seneshal of the empire.* Nay, during the interregnum which followed on the decease of the emperor Frederic II. he claimed the privilege of holding the Lieutenancy or vicariate of the empire during the vacancy of the throne; a dignity which thenceforth was held by the elector of Rheinpfalz.

In a second article I shall attempt to give an outline of the political history of the Palatinate, its division among different dynasties, its vicissitudes during the turbulent times of the Reformation and the French revolutionary wars, and its ultimate dismemberment and partial incorporation with the kingdom of Bavaria.

Lancaster, Pa. A. L. K.

* The function of the arch-seneshal consisted in the ceremony of placing the first dishes on the imperial table on the coronation day at Frankfort and on other great festivals. The old collection of German laws, the *Sachsen Spiegel*, says Book III, Art. 57, *Der Pfalzgraf von dem Rein, des Reichs Truchsaess der soll dem Kunig die ersten Schuessel fuertragen.*

Art. VII.—SHORT NOTICES.

The New American Cyclopedia: A popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by George Ripley and Charles Dana. Vol. IV. Brownson—Chartres. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 346 and 348 Broadway. 1858. pp. 766.

We announce with pleasure the appearance of the Fourth Volume of this extensive work. It is gotten up in the same finished style as the former volumes; and the work continues to give evidence of the same completeness which we have before noticed as characterizing it. This work covering from Brownson to Chartres, includes the treatment of over two thousand one hundred words. It includes also names of prominent liv-

ing men, the first article in this volume giving a very full and satisfactory account of the well-known Orestes A. Brownson. This fact indicates that this Cyclopedia will come down fully to the present time, furnishing important information in regard to the latest matters which is not to be found in other works of reference. The publication of such a work is a credit to our country ; and its learned authors deserve much credit for having thus far executed so well this arduous and responsible undertaking. Not less would we praise the enterprise of Appleton and Company in furnishing to the American public a work so valuable, and which involves at the same time so heavy a pecuniary responsibility. With pride and pleasure do we see one volume after another take its place in our Library. H. H.

The History of the Christian Church. By Philip Schaff, D. D., Author of the History of the Apostolic Church, From the birth of Christ to the reign of Constantine, A. D., 1–311. New York: Charles Scribner. pp. 535.

This welcome volume, having come to hand just as the last sheets of the *Review* were passing through the press, we have been able to ascertain only the general idea or plan of the work and read several chapters which we may regard as proper speeimens of its prevailing spirit and style. Judging from such a partial examination, we are not disappointed in our expectations.

Viewing Christ Jesus, the God-man, as the principle of Christianity, of the Church, of Theology, and of all history, whether sacred or ecclesiastical ; and the History of the Christian Church as the organic development of the life of Christ in the world by the Holy Ghost ; the author occupies the only point of observation from which he can take both a profound and comprehensive survey of the course of the Church and the world in their reciprocal relations to each other, and understand, at the same time, the internal connection of the mighty spiritual forces of the Church with the entire organism of human life and with the diversified phenomena of its progress. This true stand-point is certainly not every thing ; but it is of immense account. Without it indeed the faithful reproduction of the course of Christ's kingdom in the earth becomes an impossibility. But with it all the resources of talent, culture and learning can be made available as legitimate means to a right end. These resources Dr. Schaff possesses without doubt in a high degree. A familiar acquaintance with the sources of historical knowledge, a mature judgment, a sound, nervous logic and a lively imagination, pervaded by the energy and warmth of a living faith and a glowing heart, are all brought to bear upon this work. The result is a historical production springing in natural order and in beautiful symmetry from the Christological principle—a production which, whilst based on the precious labors of church historians and appropriating their researches with great freedom and skill, is pervaded by the force of an idea and manner peculiar to itself and is, therefore, not only distinguished from the best works on Church History, but is also a real and valuable contribution to this branch of literature.

The present volume opens with a General Introduction, which is followed by the first two Periods of Church History ; the First, entitled the Church under the Apostles extending from the birth of Christ to the death of St. John, A. D. 1–100, and the Second, entitled the Church under Persecution, from the death of St. John to Constantine the Great, A. D. 100–311. Though an independent and complete work within itself, it is at the same time presented as the first volume of a general history of Christianity, which, with the help of God, the author intends to bring down to the present age. May God continue to him life and health to finish so great and important an undertaking with the energy and compass of thought with which it has been begun.

E. V. G.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

APRIL, 1859.

ART. I.—SKETCHES OF A TRAVELLER FROM GREECE, CONSTANTINOPLE, ASIA MINOR, SYRIA AND PALESTINE.

VIII. MY WANDERINGS AMONG THE MANIOTES IN SOUTHERN PELOPONNESUS.

Description of Southern Laconia—Bardunian Filibusters—Levetzova—Battle of Trinasa—Marathonisi—Maurovouni Capture of Bavarian Troops—Zanet-Bey—Colonel Feder—Castle of Passavá—Charming Scenery—Kakovouli and its Robbers—Langadi—Dangerous Defile—Tsimova—Manners and dress of the Maniotes—Kutrakos the Pirate—Antiquities—Vitilos—Battle of Condura—Messenian plain—Historical recollections—Charles O. Müller—Temple of Diana Limniatis—Border Stones—Ithome—Messene and its ruins—Fall and restoration of ancient Messenia.

IN several earlier numbers of our Review,* I have attempted to give some account of modern Sparta, its fate during the Sclavic invasions of the middle ages and the amalgamation of those barbarians with the native Greek population. I then described the conquests and feudal settlements of the French Crusaders, their victories and defeats in the fourteenth century, the re-establishment of the Byzantine Emperors at Sparta and their final overthrow by the Turks.

Instead of continuing with the melancholy and dull

* See the three articles on "Sparta and the Dorians" in Mercersburg Quarterly Review for 1856 and 1857.

picture of Turkish despotism in Greece, occasionally interrupted by bloody but fruitless wars against the Venetian Republic and always terminating in a still more degrading subjection of the Moreote Greeks beneath the scourge of their Othoman tyrants,* I shall here invite the reader to accompany me on a wandering through the rugged mountains of Maina, and after a flying visit among the poor but hospitable Maniotes, bring him safely down on the charming plains of Messenia, where, as Eurypides says, "All is beauty aud fertility; where herds and flocks are grazing in the fields, watered by numerous rivulets; where the fiery beams of Apollo are softened by the invigorating breeze of the West and the snowy crests of Taygetus only enhance the beauty of the Paradise at their feet."

Here too I shall complete my picture of the old Dorian World by the striking contrast between Spartans and Messenians and the gallant resistance of the latter, their overthrow and restoration of their descendants, after a memorable exile of three centuries!

It was in August, 1843, while the Greeks in Athens were plotting against the government of King Otho, that I visited Sparta for the second time and spent my vacation among the Maniotes. A month later, the revolt at Athens on the night of the 15th of September, overturned the Bavarian ministers, dismissed the foreigners and established a national assembly and constitutional government. I too, from a professor of the Military College of the Euelpides, had become a pilgrim, starting off for Jerusalem! Yet, during my excursion to the Peloponnesus, I had not the remotest presentiment of the events that were brooding. In company with Chevalier Schaubert, chief architect and secretary of the ministry of the Interior, I had passed a pleasant week at New-Sparta, where the governor, Signor

* Since the above was written, a work on this subject has been published in England: "The History of Greece under Othoman and Venetian dominion, by George Finlay, LL. D. Blackwood, London. 1856." It is rather a tedious book; to have made it interesting, it would have been necessary to consult Venetian manuscripts and official documents from that period. In Raumer's *Historisches Taschenbuch* is an essay "on the Venetian dominion in the Morea," which is praised. I have never been able to get it.

Latris, offered us every facility for the prosecution of our researches and excursions in the less explored regions of Mount Taygetus.

In Sparta we ought to have sent back our horses from Argos and hired Laconian mules, as better able to pass the dangerous mountain-paths of Mani. But on a former visit to Laconia, I had succeeded, though with some difficulty, in conducting my Argolian horse along the precipices of Taygetus; we, therefore, disregarded the advice of the Spartans and retained our animals—but were soon punished by the continual danger and fatigue, to which we exposed ourselves afterwards, being obliged not only to walk the entire distance, but even to take the utmost care of the poor animals, which became exhausted and nearly broken down before we reached the plain of Messenia.

Having visited Amyclæ and sketched the ancient Doric Bridge at Pharis, which I described in my second article, we crossed the wood-clad ridge of Bardounia, from the summit of which the entire Laconian gulf is seen extending between the two parallel chains of Malevó and Taygetus, which terminate southward in the promontories of Malea and Tainaron.

This beautiful region of Laconia was formerly inhabited by a savage clan of Albanians, who, during the Russian invasion in 1770, had expelled the Greek inhabitants and appropriated to themselves the best part of the rich lands on the lower Eurotas, where their haughty Beys and Agás, like the feudal Barons of yore, maintained themselves in their strong holds, making a formidable body of several thousand horsemen. The Turkish government at Mistrás being unable to subdue them, connived at their depredations, and used them as a check upon the independent Greeks of Taygetus. But the hour of retribution was at hand! On the out-break of the Revolution in the spring of 1821, ten thousand Maniotes, commanded by Petróm Bey and Colocotronis, descended upon the plain, slaughtered the Turks and burnt Mistrás. The Bardouniote Albanians were obliged to abandon their territory, and fight

their way through their deadly enemies. They advanced in a long compact column, all well mounted. The women and children, with the baggage, were placed in the centre, while the Albanian horsemen covered the flanks with their terrible scimitars. Thus, fighting for life and death, they at last succeeded, with the loss of their baggage, in cutting through the crowds of Maniotes and escaping to Tripolezza on the Arcadian plain. But there they nearly all perished during the siege and not one of these savages ever saw his Albanian hills again. The recollection of these fierce tyrants is ever fresh among the people and the ruins of their villages and frowning towers are still seen on the slopes of the mountains. Though fertile, this region is but thinly inhabited. We stopped at the large village, Levétzova, which is situated on the southern descent of the ridge and presents the most magnificent view to the plain of Eurotas, the coast and distant port of Marathonisi. On the marshy level eastward of the Eurotas—called Helos—stood in antiquity the city whose inhabitants in their vain resistance to the Dorian Spartans were made the serfs or *Helots* of the victors. Levétzova, so beautifully placed on the main road, between Sparta and the coast, seems to have been destined to a happier fate—but, the wild spirit of its former inmates still haunts the town to this day. Murders and bloodshed are daily occurrences, and the German engineer, employed here by the Greek government to lay out the new carriage road, walked about armed to his teeth and told us, that he more than once had witnessed the violent quarrels of the mountaineers. The only relics of antiquity in the village, is a beautiful bas-relief of Castor and Pollux, holding their horses; it still embellishes the fountain-head on the square beneath a cluster of magnificent plane-trees. From here the descent to the coast is easy and delightful, through forests of olives and oaks. On the shore stands the ruinous tower of Trinisa, where, in 1826, one of the most heroic deeds of the Maniotes was performed. One hundred and twenty Greeks, led on by the brave Antonianni, here defended themselves so bravely that they kept

the whole Egyptian army of Ibrahim Pashá at bay for several days,—and at last, when they had expended their ammunition, cut their way through to their companions on Taygetus. They then defeated the enemy a second time at Kanára, forced him to retreat to Messenia, and thus saved Maina. Heaps of human bones are still seen all around the tower of Trinisa, once the residence of the proud and cruel Zalumis. If the stout and hardy Spartan had a single spark of the industrious activity that inspires the American, he would cease his quarrels and robberies and, as if by enchantment, transform this beautiful wilderness, to the happy seat of commerce and industry, of wealth and civilization, and the ruinous tower of Trinisa, with its mouldering skeletons, would become the thriving emporium of all Laconia and the interior of Pelopennesus.

At sunset we arrived at Marathonisi—the ancient Gytheion—at the entrance of Maina, or more properly *Mani*, as the Greeks call the peninsula. The small town, though not advantageously situated, is rapidly growing; some ships were lying at anchors, and now and then a steamer from Athens or the Ionian islands visits the Laconian gulf. Its port is formed by a small, flat island, Marathonisi or Fennel island, the ancient Cranäe; lying at a distance of only one hundred yards from the shore. It contains some store-houses and a Greek chapel, built on the foundations of a temple of Venus, to which Paris, the Trojan Prince, led Helena on their flight to Troy.

The ancient city of Gytheion was the port and naval station of Sparta. It became celebrated by its manufactures of purple cloth, the brilliant color of which was supplied by the purple-shell, gathered on the coast. The city lay north of the present Marathonisi, in a more fertile and pleasant position, occupying a large valley open to the sea, but hemmed in on the West by steep hills, so well fortified that the Gytheians repelled the attacks of Epaminondas and his victorious Theban army. The galley-port was artificial, being excavated in the rocky coast; immense moles or dikes are still seen extending under water for a

considerable length into the sea. Near a copious spring on shore, are brick ruins, baths from Roman times, and on a neighboring hill, from which I had a glorious view to the high waving oak-forests on the upper regions of Taygetus, is seen the cavea or hollow semi-circle of a large theatre and many foundations, partly hidden among the exuberant vines, corn-stalks, and creepers, which cover the entire soil of the ancient town. Several inscriptions are walled up in the churches of Marathonisi; they refer to decrees of the confederation of the Eleuthero-Laconians (or Free Laconians) from the times of Augustus.

The woods, covering the mountain above the town, consist of the velanidi-oak, the acorns and bark of which are exported and used for tanning. The *Velanidi* is one of the best resources of Maina; in fertile years more than three millions of pounds are sent to London, Marseilles and Leghorn. Captain Petrakis, a rich merchant at Tsimova, told me, that he yearly exported to London alone, Velanidi worth $40,000. Another precious product of Maina is the scarlet-dye,—the prino-kokki—gathered from a vermillion excrescence of the holly oak, which yields several thousand pounds. Oil, too, is as abundant as excellent, and the towns on the western coast export twelve thousand barrels in good years. As the Turks never carried their arms and destruction into the Peninsula of Maina, the olive groves are at present more flourishing there than those on the Messenian plain, where those useful trees suffered so tremendous a havoc by the axe of the Egyptians, and the young scions, lately planted, have scarcely yet begun to give any harvest.

Hospitality is one of the most prominent virtues of the Maniotes, and every where, even in the poorest villages, the inhabitants vied with one another to offer us the *konaki* or night quarters in their cottages. Here in Marathonisi, we had been the guests of Anastasios Eliades, who told us that no letters of recommendation were necessary on the mountain. Next morning at sun-rise we pursued our journey on a rugged path, running high along the sea-shore

and affording the most splendid views to the gulf, the plain of Helos and the high eastern ridge of Malevó, terminating at Cape Maléa and the distant picturesque islands of Elafonisi and Cythera, (Cerigo) one of the seven Ionian islands belonging to Great Britain.

We had heard so much about the barrenness of this southern part of Laconia and of the wretchedness of its inhabitants, that we were pleasantly surprised to find the valleys so well cultivated and the slopes of the mountains covered with forests of velanidi-oak, carubs, chesnut and magnificent pines. The villages, like eagle nests, lie perched on the most inaccessible cliffs, and are every where fortified with towers. As peace now has been restored throughout the mountains, these monuments of a barbarous age have been either dismantled or serve as the residence of the chieftains, to whom king Otho has entrusted the military command in the peninsula. The farther we penetrated into the interior the more beautiful became the scenery; here and there the view opened on the Laconian gulf, with the towering promontory of Malea in the blue distance.

Four miles south of Gytheion, lies the large village of Maurovouni or Black mountain, the ancient Larysion, which, in the recent history of Greece, has become well known as the disastrous battle-field of the Bavarians, who in 1834 here attempted, with some battalions of German infantry, to attack the Maniotes and force them to disarm their towers. The cunning highlanders permitted their inexperienced enemies to advance among the rocks in front of Maurovouni, and placing their red skull caps on the gray stones, they thus induced the Bavarians to blaze away and exhaust their shot; when all at once a column of four hundred stout Maniote riflemen lined the precipices in front, while a still larger body, leaping down the rocks like goats, cut off the retreat and thus forced several companies of Bavarians to lay down their arms and surrender as prisoners of war. They were of course stripped of arms and accoutrements and afterwards sent back to Marathoni-

si. Nine years later, in 1843, I still saw the sky-blue Bavarian uniforms worn by the poor women in Kakovouli!

The first sight of a Maniote village is extraordinary, because it consists of a number of high square towers with battlements and small round watch-towers, or *pepper-boxes*, at the corners. Some of these were formerly armed with long falconets, or swivel-guns, while the walls of the tower are loop-holed in every direction. They are generally four or five stories high, without any entrance or gate at the bottom. A high walled up stair-case is built at a distance of eighteen or twenty feet from the tower. It is fortified on the upper landing place and a draw-bridge of loose planks thrown across from a low window of the tower, forms the only communication of the warlike inmates with the world outside.

On the highest part of Maurovouni, commanding a view over sea and land of unrivalled beauty, stands the now ruinous castle of Zanét-Bey, the generous and hospitable Prince of Maina, in the early time of the French revolution—between 1780—1795—whose memory is still living in the midst of the people. A curious modern Greek poem in the common Maniote dialect, and containing a description of the country some sixty years ago, gives a most vivid picture of the manners at that time. "Zanét-Bey," says the Poet, "is our hero and father, the *firm column* of his country who has done more for its welfare than ever another chief did before him. Nay, at the hour of dinner the great bell in his castle invites all the people around freely to partake of his board—and thus friends and foes sit side by side beneath the protecting roof of Zanét-Bey."

Καμπανα στο παλατι του σημαινει βραδυ γευμα.
Την ειδα με τα ματιαμου, αυτο δεν ειναι ψευμα!
Και οσοι την ακουσουσι θαρρετικα πηγαινουν
Και τρωγουν εις την ταβλαν του και χορνασμενοι βγαινουν.

His principal enemy was the proud and avaricious Komunderákis of Kitriés, in western Maina, who, with the assistance of the Turks, attacked the Bey, but was defeated in several skirmishes. Among my cadets in the Military

College were three brothers of the family Komunderakis, young Maniotes, who always became furious when the defeat of their grand-father was mentioned.

At that time, at the beginning of the present century, the whole region was bristling with towers, and continued the scene of never ending bloody feuds until within ten years, when the government of King Otho succeeded in pacifying every part of the country. The clever Bavarian officer, who by his noble bearing and just and conciliatory measures gained the love and esteem of the mountaineers and their wrangling chieftains—was Colonel Feder, an excellent friend of mine, who himself on his return to Munich, has published an interesting work on his government in Maina. Calling the chieftains together he persuaded them for ever to renounce the hereditary revenge for blood, which for many centuries had stained the rocks of Maina with the blood of its leading families, and even with that of its priests and poor clans-men. These chiefs, by different concessions and decorations thus ably won for the King, were now the first to break down their battlements, disarm their towers, whose lower stories are now more comfortably furnished and have become of an easier access by a wooden stair-case running up along the dwelling on the outside. Colonel Feder thus disarmed all Maina in 1839–40; only a few castles in the most important positions were left entire and garrisoned by royal gendarmes. Five thousand brave soldiers were gained by Otho; the young men enlisted in several light battalions, who wore their national dress as a uniform, while their chiefs were promoted to places at court or lucrative employments in the islands. Maina has so much changed as to become the most settled and quiet province in the kingdom on my visit in 1843.

While speaking of this astonishing reform in the manners of this fierce race, I cannot omit to mention a curious fact with regard to the national pride of the chiefs. Colonel Feder, being a remarkably handsome man and enjoying the highest influence among them, resolved to settle in the country of his predilection, and one day sitting at dinner,

and in familiar conversation with the old Mavro Michalis, the so-called Prince of Maina, he said: "Compáre-mou—my god-father or brother—I love thy pretty daughter Helen, give me her hand and I will be yours forever." The old chief, with eyes flashing with anger, answered scornfully, while pointing to his pistols hanging on the wall: "Rather than marry my daughter to a Bavarian, I would shoot her down with my Turkish pistols." Colonel Feder felt so mortified and unhappy at this scene, no doubt tenderly loving the beautiful young Maniote lady, that he immediately resigned his important command and returned to Germany. On the day of his departure from Tsimova a numerous procession of Maniote chieftains and warriors presented him with a magnificent suit of arms, sabre, dagger, pistols, gun, and cartridge-box, with their furniture, all gilt and inlaid with precious stones, the proudest trophy of Maina, in their victorious wars against the Turkish Pashás; thus giving that worthy officer a distinguished token of their regard and gratitude.

The most interesting object seen from the heights of Maurovouni, is the still larger feudal castle of Passavá, built during the reign of the Ville-Hardouins, by the French Baron Jacques de Neuilly, for the defence of the fertile and highly cultivated plain of Passavá. The French château presents a noble front with its high embattled walls and round flanking towers. Within its enclosure we found gardens with orange and lemon trees and some modern dwellings, built on ancient Greek substructures. Nay a large part of the outward wall is evidently of Hellenic construction, forming masses of free-stone marble blocks, which together with some other antiquities lately found, prove it to be the city of Las or Laas (the Stone), so accurately described by Pausanias. This place is the real paradise of Maina. The deep and clear river Passavá, descending from the upper regions of Taygetus, meanders through the rich vineyards and orange and olive plantations that cover its banks, while villages and isolated towers looking out from above the trees, add a new charm

to this grand and pleasing scenery. The sky was cloudless and of the deepest blue; a light breeze from the sea refreshed the air, which was only burning and oppressive in the deep dells, through which we now passed on our approach to the main ridge of Taygetus—here called Sanghia! The sea had disappeared and we found ourselves surrounded by immense, almost perpendicular walls of lofty crags. Quite overpowered with thirst and fatigue, we slowly moved on to a spring gushing out from the rocks in the shade of some gigantic plane trees. Around the fountain of the Papà or Priest, as it was called, we found a party of Maniotes reposing beneath the trees; some of them rose and stepping forward wished us welcome to "*Kakovouli*, or the Land of Evil Council," so called from the roving habits of its inhabitants. Our Maniote friends were well dressed but unarmed; they offered us their *Zizas* or gourds, with an excellent wine, while they with great appetite tasted some of our Bologna sausage. I was particularly struck with the physiognomy of these Kakovuliotes; they are tall, well made, hardy and of a warlike deportment—yet different from that of the Albanians; their faces are regular and expressive without being handsome, like the Hydriotes. Their eye is not black—like that of the other Greeks, but gray, and their looks as piercing as if their eye balls were darting from their sockets. It appeared, as if in a minute or two, they had already reviewed and estimated all our baggage and calculated the loss, which they now sustained by having become the peaceful subjects of king Otho!

A friend of mine, a Danish traveller, Chevalier Bröndsted, who, some forty years ago, traversed these mountains, was here stopped by a band of these Kakovuliotes. "Down from your horse! Down on your face," was the stern command from an invisible enemy, who, from behind the rocks and shrubbery, announced their presence only by the muzzles of their long fire-locks—the terrible Albanian *toufek*—pointed at the breast of the Chevalier. In a few minutes, baggage, money, clothing, even books and

papers, were in the hands of tne robbers. Beiug thus left, in his deepest undress, the traveller called out to the handsome young captain, who commanded the Maniotes, "Capitano! permit me to keep my precious musquieto net—and take the rest with the Devil's passport." Laughing, the Greek answered: "By no means, Milordo! the musquietoes sting *me* too!"—and in another moment the whole gang had disappeared among the precipices around.

These roving dispositions we already find mentioned in the Byzántine historians, as characteristic of the Maniotes, and they, no doubt, may be traced back to the ancient Spartans.

The celebrated British traveller, Sir George Wheeler, tells us that when, in 1674, he was stopping at a cottage of an old woman in Maina, his hostess fell bitterly a weeping, Sir George, supposing the cause of her sorrow to be that she had nothing to offer him, began to comfort her, but she quickly answered: "That her weeping was because her sons were not at home to rob him of his baggage!" I need not add, that Sir George instantly mounted and scampered dowu the defile as fast as his donkey could carry him.

Yet, as I said, there is no part of the Peloponnesus where the beneficial effects of the present royal government are so visible as here in Maina. The Maniotes took an active part in the Russian invasion of 1770, in consequence of which the Turks introduced the rule of the Beys, who commenced in 1772 with John Kutufari, and terminated in 1837 with Petróm-Bey, the sixth Prince of Maina. The Peninsula was during that period divided into ten captaincies, or capitanata, which now exist no longer; Petróm-Bey afterwards resided at his house in Athens with a seat in the Council of State and a salary of twelve hundred dollars. Since his death in 1843, the title of Prince of Maina has been abolished. The Highlanders are fond of arms and excitement; the greater part of the young men, therefore, serve in the army; many of the poorer go as porters and workmen to Athens, from whence they return during

the Easter festival; the rest have now turned their attention to the cultivation of the arts of peace and civilization. Nay, such a change has come over the spirit of the Maniotes that the traveller of the present day can visit the wildest regions of the country without any fear of being robbed.

Beyond the Priest's fountain we entered the defile—*Langádi*—which crosses the Peninsula from east to west, dividing the high chain of Taygetus into two parts—the northern, called *Makrynon*, terminating precipitously at this pass—and the southern, rising steeply on the opposite side and sinking down on the promontory of Tainaron. This is one of the most remarkable features in the scenery of Maina;—instead of ascending to its snowy peaks, and then crossing over again to descend on the Messenian Bay, we continued our fatiguing march through the defile for three hours, in the very heart of the mountains. Nature had already changed its appearance, the most barren, dreary wilderness surrounds the wanderer. At a great elevation some straggling villages are yet visible,—but soon every indication of vegetation,—the last olive tree—the last fence of cultivated terraces—cease! The hue and color of the rocks, forming immense pyramids on all sides—are gray, mingled with dazzling white and black, which made them appear to me at a distance, as if they were composed of polished iron, and I almost fancied myself pent up within the steel-girt walls of some giant's castle. All objects around looked petrified! At last we began to ascend the stony mountain on the west; our poor horses were faltering and stumbling at every step among the huge blocks over which we led them with the greatest difficulty. The sun was just sinking behind the green Messenian hills, when on the top, the beautiful gulf of Corone spread out at our feet below. On the north, the deep bay and city of Vitilos;—on the south, perched on a rocky offset of the highest ridge,—the capital of Maina, Tsimova, with its towers, cottages and scanty olive plantations. When we crossed a still higher ridge we likewise discovered the Laconic gulf on the east, and thus the greater part of the

peninsula, with both seas spread out like a map before our delighted eyes. The direct distance between the two gulfs in a straight line is only twenty-four miles—yet the awful state of the roads and the precipitous character of the mountains, interpose far greater obstacles in the communication from one village to another, than those which in Europe and America separate entire nations! On the other hand, these steel-colored bulwarks of nature are dear to the Maniote, for they preserved him alike from the Priesty encroachments of Constantinople and the bloody scimitar of the Turk. *Tsimova*, (a Slavonic word, signifying a winter residence,) now called Areopolis, or city of Mars, is the largest town in Maina. It is almost as inaccessible by sea as by land, lying more than two thousand feet above the level of the Mediterranean, on a precipitous coast, where the narrow pathway from the harbor Limani below, runs in many windings, zig zag, along the steep, jagged crags, that at every turning of the road seem to loosen themselves from their precarious position and threaten to bury the panting and terrified traveller and his mules beneath their enormous masses. From the summit the view is astonishing indeed, extending over the immense expanse of the Messenian gulf, with the long sweep of projecting capes, rocky islands and the distant plain of Messenia. What particularly increases the quite phantastic effect of this wild scenery, is the tremendous chasm and deep inlet of the sea on the north side and the appearance of a large city, Vitilos, the ancient Oitylos—on the opposite side. Though the distance between the two cities from the heights, seems only that of a mile, yet, some days afterward, it took us more than five hours fatiguing walk to descend to the port of Limani and ascending again the rocks on the north side of the chasm to reach the ancient ruins of Oitylos. Such is the optic deception in the rugged mountains and the transparent atmosphere of the Mediterranean. Southward the view stretches along the wild and dreary coast for thirty miles to the prominent cape Thyrides, by the mariner at present called Cavo-Grosso.

The towers and houses of Tsimova lie dispersed about on the rocks half a mile from the precipice. In the square a number of Kakovuliotes were assembled, and the rich Basilios Kutrákos immediately offered us the *Konaki* in his tower. Our landlord was an active man, of the middle size, having the intelligent eye and easy address, which generally characterize the Greek, but are still more prominent among the free born highlanders of Maina. His dress, though elegant and picturesque, differed from that of the other Moreotes of the plain, who have adopted the white Albanian kilt, called *fustanella.* The Maniotes, on the contrary, like the Hydriotes and other Islanders, wear the round, laced jacket, red scarf and the large trowsers, falling in deep folds beneath the knee, where they are tied together. In the scarf or belt, they have now no longer stuck the dirk and the long horse-pistols—and a small silver sheated knife has taken the place of the terrible *yatagan!* Signor Kutrákos had during the late war been a daring pirate, with his armed and well-manned mistic making sad havoc among the Austrian merchant vessels. Immediately on our arrival a curious scene occurred which admirably depicts Grecian character and manners. My own servant in the Peiraeus, being sick at my departure for Morea, I had, on recommendation, taken into my service a workman from the harbor by the name of Georgi, who proved himself an excellent cook and a clever servant. When Georgi now entered the tower with our baggage, Signör Kutrákos looked sharply at him and said, with an air of astonishment: "Me thinks, I have seen thee before, brother, is not thy name Georgi." Georgi made an inclination of the head in acquiescence and skulked away. Kutrákos then turned toward us and said, with a smile: "I instantly knew Georgi again. I met him at Syra many years ago, during the war, when I wanted to smuggle some silk stuffs into the town. Georgi was then a custom officer; he demanded four dollars for himself and his companion, and promised to let me pass. Taking a large bundle under my arm I landed in the evening and enter-

ed the city, but was soon stopped by other custom officers, who ordered me to follow them to the office. While thus walking through the dark and narrow streets of Syra, I remarked an open store, into which I hurled my bundle, unperceived, and on my arrival at the Custom-house, I pretended to know nothing about the bundle, was acquitted and returned on board. I had never before been in Syra, and, therefore, in vain ran up and down the streets to find the house in which I had deposited my goods. But one day a woman, standing in the door of a store, said: Afendi! what do you search for? I entered, told her my adventure and she then produced my packet with my French silks. I took out the prettiest silk-gown, made her a present of it, and hurried away, glad that I had eluded the treachery of Georgi."

Afterwards, on our questioning Georgi about his double-dealing, he excused himself by saying, that he had not received a cent of his pay for months; that his poor mother was sick and dying,—that he saved her with the money he thus obtained from the PIRATE, who, by accident, fell into the hands of other officers, having come on shore too late in the evening, after his own release from guard.

Here we have the shrewdness, and yet simplicity, the treachery, and yet honesty, of the Greeks, so curiously mingled together, which being told with liveliness and wit in their own inimitable language, sometimes make us connive at their easy morals and smile at their ingenious tricks!

Our hostess, Signora Kutrakos, was as beautiful as her husband, the pirate, was intelligent and polite. She told us traits of character of her countrywomen, which showed that the present Maniote women still have the fortitude and virtue of the ancient Spartans. It is a fact that all the women of Maina not many years ago were trained to arms; and a great number of them fought at the side of their husbands. In 1826 Ibrahím-Pasha resolved from Messenia to attack and subdue the Maniotes, who immediately with all their forces hurried to the defiles at Verga, on the Messenian Gulf, where in a brilliant and hard fought

battle defeated the Egyptians. During the action, another division of Arab troops had embarked on board the fleet and making a sudden attack on Limani, the port of Tsimova, had contrived to ascend the rocky heights and threatened to occupy the town.

But the mother of Petróm-Bey, a lady sixty years of age, who had already reared a whole line of heroes, retired to the inaccessible crags of Kakovuli, assembled there all the remaining population, young and old, and pouncing upon the stupid Arabs, not only defeated them, but pursuing them closely down the terrible zig zag foot-path to the shore, forced numbers of them to precipitate themselves into the sea, and thus frustrated the designs of the cruel Ibrahim-Pasha—who never afterwards dared to disturb the mountaineers in their stronghold.

The western coast from Tsimova to the cape of Matapan, is called the *Kakovuli*, or Inner Mani, (Mesa Mani), and is the most stony and inhospitable part of the Peninsula; here it is the Poet sings: "that while the men are scouring the sea in pursuit of piracy and robbery, the women at home sow and reap, collect the sheaves at the thrashing floor, winnow it with their hands and thrash it with their feet. At night they turn the hand-mill and grind the wheat, weeping and singing lamentations for the dead."

In 1840 their scanty harvest of barley and beans failed altogether, and the Greek government of king Otho was obliged to send a number of vessels with provisions for their support, to which the inhabitants from other parts of the kingdom generously contributed.

The entire peninsula of Mani was inhabited in antiquity, and both Strabon and Pausanias have left us interesting descriptions of many cities, temples and sepulchral monuments situated all along its rugged coasts, the greater part of which we can still trace in their ruins or site at the present day. In the interior the Spartans had rich quarries of black marble, and their iron mines furnished them with that excellent metal, which rendered Spartan arms and armor celebrated throughout the ancient world. Yet the

only spot of any historical importance was the high precipitous promontory of Tainaron, now cape Matapan, seven miles in circumferance, on the summit of which stood in a sacred grove the temple of Neptune near a cavern, which the Greeks supposed to have been one of the descents to Tartarus, whence Hercules was said to have dragged forth the hell-dog Cerberus. Not only the well preserved walls of the temple and the cavern, but numerous cisterns, votive tablets, and other excavations in the rocks around prove the peculiar veneration of the ancients for this sanctuary.

To the statue of the sea-god Neptune, fled the martyrs of liberty as well as the guilty criminals; the sacred precints of the temple were the asylum of the persecuted and unhappy! Christian worship is at this day offered up on the altar, near which the austere Ephors of Sparta were concealed, when they caused their unsuspecting General Pausanias to betray his ambition and confess his treacherous alliance with Xerxes against the liberty of his native country. In later times, after the death of Alexander the Great, the promontory of Tainaron became the gathering place of the thousands of outlaws and adventurers, who sought a refuge from the tyranny of the Macedonian ruler of Greece. Here the princes of the East found large bodies of mercenary soldiers, whom they enlisted in their service. From here started, 323, the noble minded Leosthenes, with his thirty thousand Greek warriors, for the deliverance of his country, though his death at Lamia, and the subsequent victory of the Macedonian Antipater in Thessaly brought Greece under a heavier yoke than before.

The whole western coast, until a days journey north of Tsimova, a distance of fifty miles, forms a continual precipice of rugged cliffs, towering more than two thousand feet above the raging and boiling sea below, and presents the most striking contrast to the charming shores of Messenia, beyond the gulf on the west, with their olive and orange groves, interspersed with towns and villages.

Having spent a day with our Pirate-landlord and let our

poor horses recover somewhat from their fatigue, on the 10th of September we continued our route northward along the western cliffs toward Messenia. We visited the ruins of Vitilos and the temple of Serapis, and then descended to the coast along the vineyards and olive plantations of the fine villages of Thalamo, Pephnos, Cardamyle and Zarnata, which by the many French and Venetian castles, churches and convents, still in good preservation from the middle ages and by the general ease and gaiety of their industrious inhabitants prove, that the sword of the Turks never reached the secluded regions of this iron-bound coast. We stood on the Gerenian hill of old Nestor and looked down upon the fertile plains of Messenia. A long line of fortifications now in ruins, show the defile of Verga, where Ibrahim in 1826, was defeated by the Maniotes and farther on in the plain below, the olive-grove of Kundura brought to our memory the victory of the French barons and the conquests of Robert of Champlitte in the times of the Crusades, in 1207.

Here we take leave of Mani and enter Messenia, the most fertile and best cultivated region of Peloponnesus.

The land of dispute, which made Sparta covetous and unjust, is a large fertile plain, on the north and east undulating—on the south, toward the sea, a perfectly flat level. The river Pamisus, receiving numerous smaller rills, fertilizes the plain and discharges itself into the Messenian gulf. One of the highest mountains of Peloponnesus, Mount Lycæus, now called Dioforti, and the river Neda separate Messenia from Elis and Arcadia on the north. Mount Taygetus forms a still more formidable barrier east, toward Laconia; while along the western coast, a lower ridge, covered with beautiful forests, extends southward to the promontory of Akritas, now Cavo-Gallo. From the middle of the delightful plain, by the ancients termed Makaria or *Blessed*, rise the two precipitous and picturesque mountains, Evan and Ithome, both on the east united by a low and sharp ridge. Mount Ithome has in its form and strength a remarkable resemblance to the Acro-Korinth, on the

Isthmus, and it was considered as the second bulwark of Peloponnesus by Philip II. of Macedonia, who called these inaccessible fortresses the two horns of the Laconian bull, for he hoped, that when once possessing them, he could be able to master all the Peninsula.

On the eastern slope of Evan lies the monastery of Vurkano, where we were well received by the hospitable Kaloyers, and enjoyed from the battlements of the chapel a superb and extensive view over the plain, the mountains and the sea. This is the place to recall some of the most striking events in the history of the Dorians. I have already given an account of the early conquest of Messenia by Cresphontes, the Herakleid chieftain, at the head of a Dorian army, about the year 1104, B. C. The quiet husbandmen of the plain were more easily overpowered than the warlike Achæans of the Laconian highlands. In Messenia, too, we perceived the natural influence of climate and soil in the peaceful blending of both races—Dorian *warriors* and Lelegian *rustics*. How different was the fate of the Helots of Sparta? Cresphontes, and his son, Aepytos, though not without resistance from the haughty Dorian conquerors themselves, succeeded in this amalgamation; equal rights and privileges were awarded to foreigners and natives—and thus we only meet with peace, tranquility, commerce and industry on the happy plains of Messenia. While in Sparta sounds the trumpet of war, while there all is austerity and oppression, and even her virtues, negative abstemiousness and a stifling of the milder feelings of the human heart,—we listen to the sweet melodies of the shepherds' flute on the banks of the Pamisus; there something peaceful, pastoral, arcadian, pervades the character of the people; its history speaks of no conquests, we hear only of the joyous introduction of religious festivals, of benevolent gods, who are honored with rural sanctuaries and bloodless sacrifices, nay, even the names of their kings denote the shepherd and the minion of the gods; while in Sparta, the names of the Herakleid kings reminds us of prowess and glory and the thunders of war. I

could give many interesting proofs of this, but I must hurry on with my subject.

Sparta, not satisfied with the oppression of Laconia, yearned for the possession of the better lands of her inoffensive Doric brethren! Her continued encroachments, and her cruelty, at last brought on those terrible, destructive wars which, after eighty years, from 743—663, of almost incredible exertions and sufferings on the part of the Messenians, terminated with the victory of Sparta and the slavery or exile of the vanquished. No event in ancient history is more tragical, more poetical, or excites more our sympathies, than the struggle between the Messenian and the Spartan!

Messenia had the fate of Poland; she was subdued by the sword and treachery of the stronger tribe of her own nationality; and therefore the more furious and inveterate the hatred; because it was a civil war! Sparta, like Russia, not only confiscated and divided her beautiful lands, disarmed and enslaved her sons, but even added insults and outrages to her cruelty.

But in the book of Fate stands written that brave and virtuous nations shall not perish by fraud or injustice. Messenia rose again from her ashes, and so will Poland—and the day may not be far off, though her horizon is still dark and cloudy. Had the Messenians been less heroic, less persevering, they would have melted away among the foreign tribes in Italy and Africa, where they found a refuge during an exile of three centuries. But quite on the contrary, the Messenians, like the Poles, did not mix with the less noble races, among whom they encamped for a time; they remained Dorians in worship, language and habits, and when in the year 370, B. C., the shrill bugle of Epaminondas sounded a gathering of the Messenian clans far away over the seas, they obeyed, and that younger generation, who then returned as the still inveterate enemy of Sparta, joyfully rebuilt the ancient cities of Ithome and Messene, and soon gave the death-blow to their oppressor forever. Ithome and Messene, both fortress and

city—even to this day remain some of the proudest and most beautiful monuments of Hellas. Yet, before I attempt to describe them, I must here mention some important discoveries which lately have been made, and which serve to illustrate many events in Messenian history. It was this restoration of the Messenian people; it was their hatred and fear of Sparta, that resuscitated and multiplied the early traditions, the songs, and historical facts respecting the wars of the old Messenians. They were repeated by all the enemies of Sparta and thus widely spread throughout Hellas. Sparta had brave soldiers—but no historians; even her poets were foreigners. Alkman was a Lydian; and Tyrtaeus, the great bard of the Messenian wars, an Athenian. The original works from this period are lost; but part of their contents was preserved by Pausanias in his admirable description of Messenia. Yet, although he presents us with bright and lively pictures, which have a greater semblance of authenticity than many parts of the more recent history of Greece, nevertheless, modern historians, such as Charles O. Müller, and George Grote, have, in their own sceptical manner, attempted to throw doubts and disbelief on every part of Messenian history. Without the least regard to the important discoveries of latter years in Laconia and Messenia, they have begun to pull down the whole structure, and being more cruel and heartless than the Spartans themselves, they have, with a stroke of their pen, destroyed our sympathy for the tragical fate of Aristodemos and our admiration of the valor and patriotism of Aristomenes. If we would surrender the sanctuary of Grecian history to their hands, not one stone of it would be left on the other, and as Mommius, the Roman barbarian, burnt the temples of Corinth, so would our modern sceptics pervert, misrepresent and destroy the pure and simple words of the ancient historians. Thus the Messenian wars to them had become a fancy and a fiction, the dream of a Cretan poet!

But how great was the astonishment of Professor Charles Ottfried Müller, when on his arrival in Greece in 1840, he

himself found every where in Messenia the most interesting monuments still existing from those *remote* times of the early Messenian feuds in the seventh century, before Christ. On his return from the Peloponnesus he told me, that he had entirely changed his former opinion, but that he would not express himself on this subject before he had published the second edition of his work on the Dorians—which he did not live to accomplish—dying from fever a month later at Athens, on the 1st of August, 1840. His travelling notes published by Professor Adolph Schöll, contain many of these unexpected discoveries and the altered views of the great historian.

It is here the place to mention a few facts, which throw a new light on disputed points of Messenian history. Lacedæmon and Messenia possessed a joint temple on the borders, where sacrifices were celebrated in honor of Artemis or Diana Limnatis, an institution, dating from the remotest ages. During such a festival, celebrated by Spartan virgins, a body of Messenian youths broke into the sanctuary of the goddess and carried away the priestesses. The Spartan king, Teleklos, who hurried to the rescue, was slain and his followers defeated. Different versions were afterward given of this event, but the death of the Spartan king and the outrage in the temple of Diana, became the main cause or pretence of the Messenian war. For centuries the site and the existence of the temple was unknown, until the Eparch of Calamata, Kyrios Perikles Zographos, in 1836, discovered its ruins on a lofty hill on the western slope of Taygetus. These ruins consist of the substructions of the sanctuary, a number of octagonal columns and some precious inscriptions mentioning Chartos Euthykeos, the priest of Diana Limnatis. A Christian Chapel is now built on the spot by the peasants, called Vólimnos, or '*ox-pool.*' Immediately above the temple, on the highest ridge of Taygetus, four thousand five hundred feet over the plain, are standing several marble boundary stones having the inscription: "*Border of Lacedæmon toward Messenia,*" which seem to have been erected by the Roman Emperor

in order to terminate the eternal disputes between the hostile neighbors.

Another discovery was made by Prof. Charles O. Müller himself. While investigating the upper plain, situated between Mount Lycæum and Taygetus, here called Makry-Plagy, or "*the Long-Side*," where the Dorians settled after the conquest,—he found extensive ruins near the village Philia. The learned antiquary immediately undertook some excavations and ascertained that Philia, on the high road between Messene and Megalópolis, in Arcadia, was the celebrated *Andania*, the capital of the Dorian kings of the dynasty of the Aepytidæ—which was destroyed by the Spartans during the first Messenian war, and never rebuilt afterwards.

In different parts of Greece, old traditions still survive among the rustics and shepherds. Thus, for instance, the pastors on Mount Oeta will record the heroic death of Leonidas at Thermopylæ; the Albanian farmer on the plain of Marathon pretends still to hear, during night, the neighing of horses, the clashing of arms and the rush and shouts of contending armies. In Arcadia and Messenia, so long possessed by the French Barons, the native Greco-Slavonians, at their fire-side, still to this day, tell wonderful stories about the cavaliers, their tournaments—*κονταρο κτυπηματα*—and adventures. Many mountain fortresses are called, Castle of the fair Lady—(*το καστρον της ωραιας*)—and the villagers sing ballads about the bravery of the French Dame defending her possessions against the Turks, who at last succeeded, by treachery, in penetrating through the gates and killing the good Lady. It is principally the mountaineers of Taygetus, the old Klephts, who preserve their Spartan traditions. On the direct road from Mistras, westward, over the crest of the mountain, where I mentioned the old border-stones, down to Calamata in Messenia, lies a deep chasm or glen among terrific precipices, along which the path winds. I never saw a wilder scenery nor a more rugged road. My guide was dashing along in front, holding his gun with both his hands over his

neck and singing his robber songs, when he stopped short and pointing at a narrow opening in the rock opposite the valley, cried out to me: "Affendi, look there! It was through this chasm that Aristomenes, the Messenian hero followed the fox, who thus taught him to escape from the pit into which the Spartans had thrown him and his comrades." Though mere tradition, the fact itself of a wild Pallikar knowing the adventures of his forefathers twenty-five hundred years ago, among the scenes of their sufferings and glory, was so extremely interesting and exciting to me, that it made me forget all the fatigue and danger with which I was then contending.

Here in the mountains the villages are populous and flourishing, but on the whole western coast of Messenia the destruction of buildings, vineyards and olive plantations by Ibrahim Pasha and his Arabs, was most awful. The beautiful towns of Coron, Modon and Navarino, so well known from the naval combat in 1827, in which Turkey lost her fleet and all hope of re-conquering Greece,—were still lying in ruins or slowly reviving. Our principal attention will, therefore, be directed to the city of Epaminondas, at the foot of Mount Ithome, of which this picture gives a very accurate representation. The old city, built around the great temple of Zeus Ithomatas, was situated on the broad and level summit of the mountain. Here the Messenians for ten years withstood all the efforts of the Spartans; here Aristodemos, fired by ambition and superstition, sacrificed his beautiful daughter, and afterward, pursued by the furies of contrition and despair, stabbed himself on her tomb. The Spartans demolished the city, but many foundations of the temple and outer walls still exist. A Greek church crowns the summit; and the immense cisterns near, contain excellent water. After the defeat of the Spartans in the battle of Leutra in 370, Epaminondas, at the head of seventy thousand Thebans and their Allies, invaded Laconia and proclaimed the restoration of Messenia. Thousands of unhappy Helots were set at liberty and armed. The descendants of the old Messenians

in Sicily, Lower Italy and Africa, and others who, in Hellas, had found a refuge among the enemies of Sparta, all returned in triumph to their native shores, where they were received by Epaminondas and his Theban army, who with the clangor of trumpets and the sacred pomp of processions and sacrifices proceeded to re-build here on the ridge of Mount Ithome their city, which for so long a time had lain desolate. Epaminondas, during a dream, had the vision of an ancient hero, who ordered him to build the new city on the ruins of the old metropolis. The responses of the Augurs, who were consulted, whether the new city would prosper, were favorable; the victims too were propitious—every thing bore the aspect of hope and joy. Artists and workmen from every part of Greece hurried to Messenia; building materials were brought in from all quarters; both Argos and Arcadia contributed their part, and thus within the short time of sixty days, the wonderfully strong and beautiful walls, running down along the slope of the mountain from Ithome, and with thirty-six towers and several gates, all well preserved to this day, uniting with the heights of Evan, and thus enclosing a space of eight miles,—were erected beneath the superintendance of Epaminondas. Nor did he return to Bœotia until he had sufficiently strengthened this new bulwark against the haughty despotism of Sparta. The interior of the city was laid out with great magnificence; several temples arose; streets were strewn with large flag pavements; the stadium, theatre, and many highly ornamented public buildings were erected—and a new Messene grew up on the site of the old; like a fabled city, charmed into life by the sound of the Orphean harp. But this was not enough; the poor exiles now constituted their government and army and uniting again as a nation, remembered their sacred duty: of union and harmony among themselves and of war against Sparta! Therefore on Mount Ithome they solemnly invoked the Divine powers and their glorious progenitors to come and dwell among them—they specially addressed their prayers to the heroes of ancient Messenia,

Eurytos, Cresphontes—and above all, with the unanimous voice of the whole nation, to Aristomenes, whose statues adorned the square and principal sanctuaries of the city.

I said that the walls, with their square or round towers and double gates, are in excellent preservation, and exhibit the finest specimens of military architecture in Greece;—nay, they make us, as it were, the cotemporaries of Epaminondas, under whose direction they were raised, by exhibiting to us a complete model of the systematic fortifications of that age. The walls are built in horizontal courses, with huge right angular stones. Almost all the towers are square built, in two stories, with windows and embrasures, splayed on the inside to admit more light and afford a freer range for the emission of the projectiles from within. Particularly beautiful is the large north-western gate, which led to Arcadia; it incloses a court sixty-three feet in diameter, in the wall of which is a niche for a statue, on each side of the gate. The outer gate between its huge flanking towers is in good preservation; but on the inner door the soffit, an immense stone twenty feet in length has fallen, so as to rest against the side of the door-way. The rich vegetation of shrubs and trees around, and the magnificent back-ground of Mount Ithome, with its deep clefts and bold precipices, altogether form one of the most picturesque views in that land of beauty and poetry.

At the time of the French expedition in the Morea, in 1828, Colonel Bory de Saint-Vincent undertook extensive excavations within the range of the walls, where a number of precious antiquities were found; nay, the greater part of the ancient city, below the fountain of Mauromati or Black-Eye—the ancient Klepsydra—were laid open; the stadium, theatre, several temples, baths, streets, numerous bas-reliefs and architectural ornaments were discovered—but so rich is the soil of happy Messenia, so exuberant the growth of her vegetation, that almost all these curiosities have vanished beneath the thick groves of myrtle, laurel, agnus-castus, lentesk, juniper, wild olive, and a hundred other odorous and beautiful shrubs, while the industrious

peasants of Mauromati, a pretty village, built in this paradise, around the copious spring of Mount Ithome, have cultivated every span of ground with Indian corn, wine and tobacco—in such a manner that the traveller at the present day must rest satisfied with the grand sweep of walls and towers, running up hills and down valleys, in an immense curve toward Mount Ithome—with the magnificent view from the summit far away on sea and land,—with the pleasing or exciting recollections of the joys and sorrows, the virtues and crimes of the ancient Dorians,—*Messenians* as well as *Spartans*, who here met in deadly strife. And at last, wearied in mind and body by all these impressions, he, like myself, will be glad to retire to the frugal supper and excellent wine of the hospitable monks of Vurkano !

Lancaster, Pa. A. L. K.

ART. II.—NATURAL AND SUPERNATURAL.

Nature and the Supernatural, as together constituting the One System of God. By HORACE BUSHNELL. New York: Charles Scribner. 1858.

A truly interesting work, as may be easily presumed at once from its authorship and title. No subject could well be more important, especially for the present time, than that which is here brought into view; and there are few men better fitted than Dr. Bushnell to discuss any theme of the sort in an earnest, vigorous, and manly way. We welcome the book, with all our heart, as a most valuable accession to the theological literature of the age, and trust that it may exert a large and wide influence in the service of truth. It is no hasty production, but the carefully studied and well digested treatment of a great question, which has been before the mind of the author for years, and

on which plainly he has bestowed the whole force of his ripest and best thoughts. The book, therefore, is one which requires study also on the part of the reader. It is not just of the *current* literature sort, formed for the easy entertainment of the passing hour. It grapples with what the writer holds to be the religious life question of the age; its course is everywhere, more or less, through inquiries which are felt to be both intricate and profound. And yet with all this, the work is never either heavy or dull. On the contrary, it may be said to overflow with genial life. Dr. Bushnell has contrived to throw into it the full vivacity and freshness of his own nature. It is rich throughout with thoughts that breathe, and words that glow and burn. A sort of poetical charm is made to suffuse the entire progress of its argument, relieving the severity of the discussion, and clothing it oftentimes with graphic interest and force. Altogether the book is one which deserves to live, and that may be expected to take its place, we think, among the enduring works of the age. It is of an order, in this view, with Hugh Miller's *Testimony of the Rocks;* and as an argument for the truth of the Christian religion, may compare favorably with Reinhard's *Plan of the Founder of Christianity.*

So much we may say, without pretending to endorse in full the course of thought presented in Dr. Bushnell's book. The worth and importance of such a work are not to be measured simply by what may be considered the validity of its opinions at particular points. We may find reason to question many of *its* propositions—we may feel ourselves constrained to pause doubtfully in the presence of much to which it challenges our assent—and yet be fairly and rightly bound, notwithstanding, to own and honor its superiority, as shown in the profound significanee of its general thesis, the reigning scope of its discussion, the reach and grasp of its argument taken as a whole. The claim to such respectful homage, in the case before us, is one in regard to which there can be no dispute.

We agree fully with Dr. Bushnell, in believing the ten-

dency of the present time to be fearfully strong toward Rationalism—that form of infidelity, which seeks to destroy Christianity, not so much in the way of direct opposition to its claims, as by endeavoring to drag it down from its own proper supernatural sphere into the sphere of mere nature, making it thus to be nothing more in the end than a particular phase simply of natural religion itself. On both sides of the Atlantic, we find a large amount of intelligence enlisted openly in the defence of this view; seeking, with no small measure of learning and ingenuity, to resolve all the higher aspects of the Gospel into poetry and myth, and pretending to bring out the full sense of it at last in the experiences of a purely humanitarian culture. But it would be a most inadequate view of the case, to suppose the evil of such unbelief confined to any formal demonstrations of this sort. As a silent tendency—a power secretly at work to sap the foundations of faith and piety—the rationalistic spirit in question takes in a vastly wider range of action. Multitudes, as Dr. Bushnell observes, are involved in it virtually as a system of thought, without being themselves aware of the fact. They profess to honor Christianity as a divine revelation, take its language familiarly upon their lips, persuade themselves it may be that they continue strictly loyal to its heavenly authority; and yet all the time they are false in fact to its claims, casting it down from its proper excellency, and substituting for it in their minds another order of thought altogether. In this way, we are surrounded on all sides with a nominal Christianity, which is little better in truth than a sort of baptized Paganism, putting us off continually with heathenish ideas expressed in Christian terms.

Our public life is full of such essential infidelity. It reigns in our politics. It has infected our universal literature. The periodical press floods the land with it every week. It makes a merit generally indeed of being friendly to religion; but it is plain enough to see, that what it takes to be religion is something widely different from the old faith of the Gospel in its strictly supernatural form. It is,

when all is done, naturalism only, of the poorest kind, dressed up in evangelical modes of speech. That it should be able to pass current for any thing better—that the public at large, the so called Christian public, should show itself so widely willing to accept any such authority as having any sort of force in matters of religion—is only itself a most painful sign of that general weakening of faith, of which we are now speaking as the great moral malady of the times. Already too the disease has entered deep into our systems of education; and there is but too much reason to fear, that its worst fruit on this ground is yet to come.

Our system of public schools is often spoken of, as being the strength of our institutions, the safeguard of our liberties, the crown of our civilization, the distinguishing glory of our truly enlightened age. But we hazard nothing in saying, that it proceeds from beginning to end, not on the believing recognition of the supernatural claims of Christianity, but on their virtual rejection and denial. It does not help the matter in the least, that it offers no formal contradiction to the idea of revealed religion; the burden of the difficulty lies just here, that claiming, as Christianity does, to be a supreme authority for men's minds, it is notwithstanding prohibited by the system from the exercise of any such authority in what is allowed on all hands to be a fundamental interest of our life—that it is politely bowed to the one side, and made to stand out of the way, while another theory of religion altogether is practically introduced into its place. The case is too clear for any controversy. Education, to be Christian, must make earnest with the realities of a higher life in their own true and proper form, subordinating all merely natural and temporal ends to the claims of God and the eternal world, under such explicit and positive view. Under any other character, it must stand condemned at once, as being hostile in fact, and not friendly, to religion. Tried by this rule, our common school system, as it now prevails, loses all title to respect. It ignores positive Christianity, and pretends to educate the young without its help; as though it were pos-

sible to fit them for the duties and trials of life, by holding their minds down to the things of the present world only, without any sort of reference to their highest destiny as it is comprehended in the "powers of the world to come."

All such education is in truth "God-less." It reflects honor on the Catholic Church, we think, that she condemns it, and requires her membership to keep clear of it, though it be at the heavy cost of forming and maintaining separate schools for their own use. For what better proof could she furnish, that for *her* at least the truths of religion, in the form in which she holds them, are indeed articles of faith, which as such carry with them supernatural authority, and are not to be set aside, or suspended in their force even for a moment, in favor of any other interest or opinion whatever? If other ecclesiastical communions show themselves more liberal here, and less jealous for the rights of what they hold to be the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God, it is hard to see certainly how it can redound much to the credit of their faith. It would seem to imply rather one or the other of these two things: either that they have no clear apprehension of any positive distinctions in the Christian scheme, or that all such distinctions are with them at last matters of opinion only rather than the power of a living creed. To speak of an extra-ecclesiastical training in the case, that may be allowed to provide for the interest of religion in a general way, handing over its subjects afterwards to the care of the different religious communions, to be completed by them severally in their own way, is only to expose the radical defect of the whole scheme. Every such view proceeds on an assumption, which is found to break down in the end all real distinction, between positive Christianity and the religion of mere nature clothed with its name. Neither is it enough, as some dream, to have the Bible regularly read in such schools; as though that somehow, in and of itself, were positive Christianity, and sufficient in this naked way to meet and satisfy in full the demands of a Christian education. They show a wonderfully poor conception of religion, who think to vindicate its supre-

macy, and to gain free field for its proper action, in any such easy manner as this. As the use of the Bible falls in readily, we can see everywhere, with the conflicting views of all religious parties and sects, so has it been abundantly shown in our time, that it may be made to suit itself just as readily also to the views and wishes of those who turn all revelation into a mere fable. Infidels and naturalists have showu themselves, in many cases, most zealous for the honor of the Bible in such abstract view, and none commonly are more apparently cordial in crying out for its untrammeled use in the public schools. They are perfectly content to have it thus dignified as a text book of morality, patriotism, and sentimental humanitarianism, if only it be to the exclusion of Christianity in its concrete supernatural form, and in the midst of associations that go always to sink the heavenly sense of it down to the level of their own miserable unbelief. It needs more a great deal than this, we repeat, to redeem our schools from the charge of being against Christ, because they are not with him, and for him, in any direct positive way.

The case indeed speaks for itself. If there be anything that may be said specially to distinguish our system of common schools, it would seem to be the intense worldliness of their spirit, as opposed to all practical belief in the existence of things unseen and eternal. They are the agency of the State, directed only toward secular and political ends. The spirit that breathes through their administration is predominantly earthly. Their educational apparatus looks everywhere only to the things of this world. All turns on knowledge—the knowing of things in a simply natural way, for the ends and uses of the present life; as though this, after all, were the "chief end of man," and the highest good proposed to him this side the grave. No wonder, that in such circumstances the very atmosphere of the school room should come to be impregnated, as it were, with the poison of unbelief, and that the minds of the young, exposed to its daily influence, should grow up cold, hard, materialistic, impassive to heavenly impressions, and

ripe at last only for the deeds of the flesh. Is not this result showing itself plainly enough already, for any observing mind? And is there not every reason to fear, that it will come out more terrible still with the progress of time?

Unfortunately the evil answers but too well to the reigning temper of the times. The education of the schools finds no proper corrective in the tone of thought which prevails generally on the outside of the schools. Indeed if that were the case, no such education could be allowed to exist. It argues an eclipse of faith, that so great an interest can be thus passively surrendered, in a Christian land, to the power of unbelief. That must be at best a low sense of what religion is, which can suffer mere intellectual training in any view to be regarded as something of more account than virtue, piety, and holiness. It involves infidelity, to magnify such culture, as is commonly done in our time, at the expense of these higher interests; as though knowledge under any circumstances—and more especially an ability to read, write. and cast up accounts—must needs be a blessing to the possessor of it, and to the community at large; as though the whole problem of individual and social prosperity were to be successfully solved by the art of the schoolmaster, going abroad and letting light into human souls in such style; as though education, in any form like this, might be expected ever to do away with the evils of life, and to beautify it at last into anything like the character designed for it by God. Away with all such abominable glorification of mere naked mind, without any regard whatever to the wants and necessities of the immortal spirit! It is the very cant of infidelity itself. The chief end of man, is to glorify God and to enjoy him forever. The "one thing needful" is not to *know* the shadows of this world, but to *be* in the powers of the world to come. The smallest measure of faith, is a higher accomplishment than any amount of learning without faith. Devout ignorance is infinitely better than profane unsanctified science. These are first truths, foundation maxims we may say, in the kingdom of Christ; and not to know

them, not to have them in mind, not to be spontaneously disposed to fall in with them at once as the only true order of thought and life, is necessarily to have the proper sense and glory of that kingdom obscured to our view, and to be thus to the same extent under the dominion of an opposite antichristian mind. That precisely is the ruling defect of our time. We read of what are called the "ages of faith." Ours, it is plain to see, is no such age. We glory in our intelligence; but it is more earthly in its order than heavenly. We boast of our improvements and arts; but they serve to fix our minds on material interests, far more than on such as are spiritual and divine. We exult in our general civilization, as though it carried in it somehow the promise of the Christian millennium itself, and might be taken for the harbinger of the "new heavens and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness." But, alas, it is hard to see how it may be shown to be, either the product of those supernatural forces which are revealed to us by the Gospel, or the proper expression of their presence in the world, or a positive momentum in any way bearing them onward to their ultimate destination and end. It is not just the "wisdom and power of God unto salvation," we apprehend, in the old sense of St. Paul. The angel of St. John flying in the midst of heaven, and having the everlasting gospel to preach to every nation, kindred, and tongue, can hardly be expected to appear in any such form and shape.

We feel the full force of what Dr. Bushnell says on this subject. As an argument for the supernatural truth of Christianity, against the naturalistic tendencies of the age, his book is altogether timely. The evil enters into all spheres and departments of our modern life. It needs to be met in a bold and strong way. "We undertake the argument," says the distinguished author, "from a solemn conviction of its necessity, and because we see that the more direct arguments and appeals of religion are losing their power over the public mind and conscience. This is true especially of the young, who pass into life under the combined action of so many causes, conspiring to infuse a

distrust of whatever is supernatural in religion. Persons farther on in life are out of the reach of these new influences, and, unless their attention is specially called to the fact, have little suspicion of what is going on in the mind of the rising classes of the world—more and more saturated every day with this insidious form of unbelief. And yet we all, with perhaps the exception of a few who are too far on to suffer it, are more or less infected with the same tendency. Like an atmosphere, it begins to envelope the common mind of the world. We frequently detect its influence in the practical difficulties of the young members of the churches, who do not even suspect the true cause themselves. Indeed, there is nothing more common than to hear arguments advanced, and illustrations offered, by the most evangelical preachers, that have no force or meaning, save what they get from the current naturalism of the day. We have even heard a distinguished and carefully orthodox preacher deliver a discourse, the very doctrine of which was inevitable, unqualified naturalism. Logically taken, and carried out to its proper result, Christianity could have had no ground of standing left,—so little did the preacher himself understand the true scope of his doctrine, or the mischief that was beginning to infect his conceptions of the Christian truth."

Dr. Bushnell's argument for the supernatural, is made to rest centrally upon the person of Jesus Christ. This constitutes its main beauty and force. It forms the best distinction, and greatest merit, of the later modern theology generally, so far as it shows itself to be possessed of power and life, that it seeks more and more to make Christ in this way the principle of all faith and knowledge; taking up thus anew, as it were, the grand Christological views of the Nicene age, and laboring to carry them out in full order and harmony to their last results. Great praise is due here to the mighty genius of Schleiermacher; who, however defective his own views of the person of Christ were, may be said to have inaugurated a new era of theology in Germany, by forcing attention to this point as the true begin-

ning of all reality and certainty in religion. Under the inspiration of this thought, all theological studies there might seem to have started again into fresh vigorous life, rising from the tomb into which they had been cast by the melancholy reign of Rationalism in previous times. A new interest was felt to be infused into all the facts and doctrines of revelation, by the light which was shed upon them from the acknowledged centre of the Christian system. They acquired a deeper significance, and became in this way subjects for more earnest inquiry and profound study. Christological thinking—that which, instead of looking primarily to the things taught and done by Christ, fixes its whole gaze at once on the mystery of his person, the glorious fact of the incarnation, and uses this as a commentary and key for the right understanding of all things besides—has come to pervade and rule more or less all spheres of religious science. The method is so plainly founded in the very nature of Christianity, and grows forth so immediately from the apprehension of its supernatural character, that it must prevail more and more, not only in Germany, but in all other countries also, wherever it may be felt necessary to deal earnestly with the mysteries of religion, over against the growing naturalism of the age. If these are to be upheld successfully as objects of faith, transcending the constitution of nature, it can only be by falling back upon their ultimate ground in Christ, and asserting in the first place the absolute verity of his person, as the principle and source of what is thus to be regarded as a new creation altogether. Not only our systematic divinity, but our homiletic teaching also, needs to be fortified in this way against the downward tendency of the times, by being brought back to what is substantially the method of the old Apostles' Creed—that most simple, but at the same time most grand and sublime confession, into which, as a mould, the faith of the universal Church was cast in the beginning.

Nothing is more certain, than that Christ himself, as the author of the Gospel, claims for his own presence in the world a supernatural character, which is regarded as reach-

ing out to the whole Christian system also from his person. He is not of this world, according to his own declaration —not the efflorescence and perfection simply of its natural life in any view, but the introduction into it really and truly of life and power in a new and higher form. The great men of the heathen world, Pythagoras, Socrates, Plato, and such like, with all the towering superiority of their nature, were nevertheless the historical product always of laws and forces belonging to humanity as it existed before. We may say the same also of such men as Moses, David, Isaiah, and the prophets generally, among the Jews. The supernatural as it appeared in them, and by them, was not properly of themselves, formed no part of their being, but met them, as it were, from abroad, in a sort of outward and transient way. Moses could not say: "I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me." "I proceed forth and come from God"—"Ye are from beneath; I am from above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world"—"I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go to the Father"—"And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." All men would be shocked with language any way approaching this, from his lips. But all is different with Jesus Christ. This exactly is the universal tenor of his language in regard to himself; and with such high assumption agrees in full the whole theory of the Gospel exhibited to us in the New Testament. In no other view is it intelligible. The strictly supernatural origin of Christ and his salvation is everywhere taken for granted, and rested upon silently as a first truth lying at the foundation of all its doctrines and facts; so that it is really one of the strangest things in the world, to find any class of men pretending to accept it as true in connection with any other hypothesis—so intimately interwoven this thought, of an order of existence higher than the whole constitution of the world as it stood before, would seem to be with what we may call the self-representation of the evangelical scheme at every point.

The position of Christ, his relations to the world, all the aspects of his character, all his works and all his pretensions, are brought into view everywhere as being in full unison and harmony with his bold claim to a heavenly and divine origin. His birth is by the Holy Ghost; on which account he is called the Son of God. Angels herald his advent into the world. The powers of heaven descend upon him at his baptism. He is no prophet simply among men, closing the Old Testament line, but the bearer of truth and grace in his own person. A new order of existence opens upon the world, in the mystery of his being. In him was life—life in its original, fontal form—and the life became the light of men. It was not his office, therefore, primarily, to publish the truth as something different from himself, to mediate between earth and heaven, man and God, in any mere outward way. His own *being* constituted the deepest and last sense of the Gospel, the burden of its overwhelming mystery. "I am the way," we hear him saying, "the truth, and the life"—not the index simply to these things, but the actual presence and power of the things themselves. "I am the resurrection and the life"—not the promise and pledge only of such glorious boon, but the full realization of it as a fact now actually at hand in my person. For "he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." Again, "He that believeth on me hath everlasting life—Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." God was in him, reconciling the world unto himself. He is the propitiation for our sins—our righteousness—our peace—the organism of our redemption—the everlasting theatre of our salvation. He stands in the world a vast stupendous miracle—the miracle of a new creation. He is greater than all the powers, higher than all the glories of the natural world. Nay, he is before all things, and by him, and in him, all things consist. His life, therefore, included in itself, from the beginning, even under its human form, the principle of full

victory over all the vanity and misery which are in the world through sin; so that when he went down into the grave, and descended into hades, it was only that he might return again, leading captivity captive, and ascend up on high, to inaugurate his kingdom, in its proper spiritual form, as a new immortal constitution, against which the gates of hell should have no power to prevail to the end of time.

So lofty, so wide, so every way large, beyond all the measures of man's merely natural life, or simply human history, are the terms and representations in which the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in wonderful, unfaltering consistency with itself throughout, bears witness to its own origin, character, and power. If it be not in the fullest sense—first in the person of Christ himself, and then in the outworkings and ongoings of his grace and power in the system of Christianity as a whole—the presence of a new supernatural life in the world, an order of existence which was not in it before, and which is not in it still beyond the reach and range of this fact; if it be not this, we say, and nothing short of this, then must it be denounced at once as being the most daring and wicked imposture ever practiced upon the credulity of the human race.

But let any one pause now, to consider what an amount of peril is involved in so vast and broad a claim, and to what an ordeal Christianity has necessarily subjected itself, in presuming to take this lofty position, and thus binding itself to satisfy in full the terms and conditions of its own world-embracing problem. A consistent fiction is hard in any case, where it has to do with concrete realities under a known form, and is allowed to extend itself at all to specific details; but it becomes of course more and more difficult, and at last is found to be utterly impracticable, in proportion precisely as the points to be met and answered in this way become more and more significant, multitudinous, and complex. Suppose Christianity then to be such an *invention*—a bold hypothesis merely, got up to solve the

inmost meaning of the world's life, and to play off in spectral style a supernatural economy of salvation commensurate with all the wants and aspirations of our fallen race—and how certainly may it not be expected to break down, by its own incongruities and contradictions, almost immediately at every point. Never did a scheme of religion, surely, offer itself of its own accord to a more searching trial of its merits and claims.

For the supernatural here is no transient phenomenon merely, no fantastic avatar, no theophany only in the Old Testament style; much less a doctrine simply, or theosophic speculation. It is made to challenge our faith and homage, as an abiding fact, linking itself organically with the general life of the world, and carrying it out historically to its highest and last sense. It must then be supremely natural, as well as overwhelmingly supernatural; no product of nature plainly, and yet in such harmony with it, that it shall seem to be at the same time its full outbursting glory and necessary perfection. The relation between God's first creation, and that which claims to be in this way God's second creation, may not be conceived of as contradictory, violent, or abrupt. The divine economy which embraces both—proceeding, as it does, from the mind of Him to whom all his works are known from the beginning—must be a single system at last, in absolute harmony with itself throughout.

The whole constitution of the world, therefore, both physical and moral, must be found to come to its proper conclusion in Christ, showing him to be in very deed the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, of all God's works.

The physical must show itself every where the mirror of the spiritual and heavenly, as these come out fully at last only in the form of Christianity. Not as having any power to make them known by its own light originally; but as answering to them, in the way of universal parable, when it comes to be shone upon from their higher sphere; even as to the mind of Christ himself, the birds of the air, and

the flowers of the field, become types and symbols of righteousness at once, the moment they are needed for any such purpose.

In its whole organization again, the physical, as being plainly a progressive order of things reaching towards the unity of some common end, must put on the character of a ground preparation and prophecy, from first to last, looking continually to the advent of Christ as the only sufficient fulfilment of its sense. This it will be found to do, if it have no power to stop in its own order, or to come to an end in itself, but be forced and driven, as it were, upward and forward always, from one stage and level of existence to another—each lower range foreshadowing still the necessary approach of a higher—till it gains its full summit finally in man; and so transcends itself, if we may use such an expression, in the presence of a new *moral* world, which afterwards again shows itself in its own turn unable in like manner to come to any pause or rest, till it is filled out and made complete by the supernatural grace of the Gospel.

It will be then, more especially, as tried by the actual conditions of this moral world—the circumstances and necessities of our general human life—that the Christian system, in the view now under consideration, must pass through its severest ordeal. Its theory of humanity must be such as to fall in plainly with the actual condition of humanity in the world; while all the lines of history, and all all the deeper forces of man's life, shall be found every where struggling toward it, and either consciously or unconsciously bearing witness to its claims.

The general fact of man's sin and misery must be such, as to agree with the hypothesis of a strictly supernatural redemption. If the evil were found to be of a superficial character only, neither deeper nor broader in fact than the measure of our life in its ordinary natural form—and in such view capable, accordingly, of being surmounted in some way by the powers and possibilities of this life in its own sphere,—the idea of a redemption descending into it from above, in the form of a new creation brought to pass

by the mystery of the Incarnation, would be convicted at once of being unreasonable and false. To justify any such mystery, it must appear that sin is a disorder which underlies the universal nature of man as it now stands; that it is itself a sort of supernatural fall or lapse in his life; that the whole present order of his existence is subjected to vanity and death by reason of it; that all other remedial agencies brought to bear upon the case, philosophical, educational, political, socialistic, and such like, have proved themselves thus far, and must prove themselves, utterly inadequate to its demands, coming, as it were, infinitely short of the last ground and seat of the evil; that it can be conquered, therefore, and rolled back in its consequences, if conquered ever at all, only by a force deeper and more comprehensive than the whole order of the world in its natural view, which, as such, shall show itself sufficient at the same time to break through this order altogether, and to rise above it, abolishing death itself, and bringing life and immortality to light. The New Testament doctrine of Christ, involved necessarily a corresponding doctrine of man. No Pelagian Anthropology, denying or slurring over the fact of Original Sin, can move hand in hand, in one and the same line, with a strictly theanthropic Christology.

It must appear still farther, if Christianity be true, that the religious life of the world generally, under what may be denominated its merely natural form, looks toward it, calls for it, reaches after it in all manner of ways, and finds the burden of its dark riddle fully solved at last only in its august presence. Rooted as they are in the same ground, the constitution of human nature itself, all religions must have to some extent a common character, must be concerned with the same problems, must work themselves out into more or less analogous results. The relation then of the absolutely true religion to religions that are false, can not be regarded as one of abrupt and total difference; it should be taken rather to resemble the relation that holds between man in the natural creation, and the manifold forms of animal life in the world below him—which, however far they

may fall short of his perfection, carry in themselves, notwithstanding, though it may be in very distorted and fantastic style, some portion still of the idea which is finally disclosed in his person, and thus join in foreshadowing this darkly from all sides as their own last end and only proper meaning. False religions, in such view, should open a wide field of analogical comparison, serving to establish the idea of religion in its true form; not as leading over to it in their own order, not as being on the same plane with it in any sense; but as bringing into view wants, aspirations, questions, problems, soul-mysteries in every shape, which only the true religion at last is able fully to satisfy and solve. Should the grand supernatural facts and doctrines of Christianity seem to be met in this way with dull echoes, and wild visionary caricatures, of their heavenly sense, in the mythologies of the heathen world, the fact would form certainly no ground of objection to its claims, but only a powerful argument in their favor. Heathenism *ought* to be, in such manner, through its whole wide empire of darkness and sin, an unconscious prophecy of Him, who proclaims himself the desire of all nations and the light of the world.

All History again must come to its proper unity in Christ, if he be indeed what he is made to be in the Gospel. Here, as in the constitution of Nature, God must have a plan in harmony with itself throughout; and this plan can not possibly go aside from his main thought and purpose in the government of the world. It must centre in the Incarnation.

Then after all this, what a range of comparison and trial for the Christian system is presented to us in the general economy of Revelation itself. For this is no single or narrow fact simply; nor yet a multitude of separate, disjointed facts; but a vast and mighty organization of facts rather, involving the most manifold relations, and reaching through long ages back to the very beginning of the world. Religion in this form is exhibited to us under different dispensations, and yet as being always the same, from the first obscure promise in the garden of Eden, down to the

fulness of time, when the Word became flesh and tabernacled among men in the person of Jesus Christ. "God," we are told, "who at sundry times and in divers manners spake in time past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds." All these voices of old then—in paradise, before the flood and after the flood, through the patriarchs, in the giving of the law, and by the whole long line of the prophets from Moses down to the ministry of John the Baptist—must come together at last in Christ as their only full sense and necessary end. The correspondence cannot limit itself to a few predictions and types, put forward here and there in an abstract outward way; it must enter into the universal structure of the entire revelation. The Old Testament throughout must be, not only in full harmony with itself, but in full organic union at the same time with the central idea of the New Testament; so that everywhere, in all its oracles, histories, and institutions, it shall be found prefiguring this, reaching toward it, and laboring as it were to find in it its own true rest and glorious consummation.

But by far the most difficult part of the whole problem, it is plain, must be finally to satisfy what we may call the internal conditions and requirements of this New Testament idea itself; by setting it forth in such a form, that it shall appear to be every way worthy of itself, and true throughout to its own constituent terms. Only think, what is involved in an attempt to *construct* a full historical Christ in the manner of the Gospel. Not only to dare so bold a thought as that of the Incarnation, but to dare also beyond this the reduction of such a thought to full artistic representation, in the form of an actual human life; to project and carry out a biography of "God manifest in the flesh," the Word Incarnate, in whom dwelt the "fulness of the Godhead bodily;" the portraiture of such a character, the picture of such a life, brought down to particulars and details, and exhibited as moving, speaking, acting and working, through a course of years, in the midst of actual

human relations—the whole so ordered as to show itself in all its connections, antecedents, and consequents, harmoniously consistent with the grand fundamental thought on which it is made to rest. It is not possible surely to conceive of an ordeal more severe, than that to which Christianity has subjected itself, in coming before the world with its history of Jesus Christ, as we have it briefly outlined in the Apostles' Creed, from his miraculous birth of the Virgin, on to his resurrection from the dead, and his glorious ascension to the right hand of God. For so coming in the flesh, he must have an advent answerable to the glorious mystery of his person; such as shall bring with it the full presence of a new creation, and yet serve to set him really and truly in the bosom of the old creation. He must have a mission commensurate with his nature. He must be at once perfectly human, and yet no less perfectly divine, in all his teachings and doings. He must be in the world, as being all the time above it, and as comprising in himself the power of a life destined to triumph over it at last through all ages. His history may not end in the grave; and just as little may it come to a Gnostic conclusion in the clouds. Such a manifestation in the flesh must justify itself in the spirit; opening the way for a new order of grace among men, that shall be found in fair keeping to the end of time with the vastness of the economy serving thus for its introduction—a thought which leads at once to the idea of the Church, exactly in the order of the Creed, as being the body of Christ, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.

The terms and conditions of the Christian problem being in such general view what we have now seen them to be, the truth of Christianity, it is easy to see, must turn mainly on its power to solve them in a satisfactory way; and in such case, this must be taken always as the first and strongest of all arguments in its favor. Indeed no argument can be of force aside from this. The Christian Evidence thus centres ultimately in Christ himself. He is emphatically the "Light of the world." For the natural cannot reveal,

or make certain in any way, the supernatural; but needs this rather to bring out clearly its own sense; and so Christ descending into the world as the fullest and most perfect revelation of the supernatural, must be regarded necessarily as the very principle and source of all real illumination for men. As the absolute truth, he must in the nature of the case prove and authenticate himself.

This, however, does not imply of course that little or no account is to be made of evidences for the truth of Christianity beyond the person of Christ; miracles, for example, prophecies, types, providences, voices of nature and grace conspiring in its favor. It goes only to hold such proofs to their right order and place. Their proper force lies in their organic relation to the presence of Christ himself in the world. They bear witness to him, only by means of the significance and power which they themselves derive from his person. They are the necessary seals of his supernatural mission; which however have force, like all seals, only as they are attached to what they thus serve to authenticate, and not as torn from it, and viewed in any separate and independent way.

The main weight of the argument for the supernatural, in Dr. Bushnell's book, is made to rest on Christ, as being the grand first principle of proof in this order of existence —an order which completes itself fully at last only in the fact of the Incarnation. "The character and doctrine of Jesus," we are told, "are the sun that holds all the minor orbs of revelation to their places, and pours a sovereign self-evidencing light into all religious knowledge." Still, before coming to this, the first part of the work is very properly occupied with the subject under a more general view; the purpose being to show, that the supernatural itself is not something absolutely foreign and strange to the constitution of the world in its natural form, but an order rather which is anticipated and called for by this, and that comes out at last, therefore, in full harmony with its deepest wants, in full explication, we may say, of its inmost meaning and sense.

Here we find a great deal, of course, that is entitled to our admiring interest and attention, as going to establish, in the way of analogical and presumptive reasoning, both the possibility and the necessity of the supernatural, considered as being the proper complement or filling out of the natural—both joining to constitute what the book denominates "the one system of God." The argument, however, as conducted by Dr. Bushnell, is made to involve and assert some things which it seems to us not easy to allow.

In the first place, we demur to his line of distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Nature he defines to be the simply physical order of the world, made up of causes and effects flowing in constant succession, by a necessity that comes from within the scheme itself; in which view, we are told, "that is supernatural, whatever it be, that is either not in the chain of natural cause and effect, or which acts on the chain of cause and effect in nature, from without the chain." In this way, the supernatural is brought to assume at once a most familiar every day character, by entering into the very conception of our own personality; for this, as involving intelligence and will, is not under the law of cause and effect in the manner of the simply physical world, but carries in itself the power of acting on the course of this law from without, in a free self-determining way, so as to produce results, that nature of itself, as here defined, could not bring to pass.

Now it is perfectly fair, to make use of this relation of mind to matter in the world, as an analogical argument for the possibility of an intervention, that shall be found descend ing into the world miraculously from a higher sphere. But it is pushing the matter too far, we think, to make the first relation of one order, and parallel in full, with the second. That is not the common view of the case certainly; and the interest of the supernatural is likely to lose by it in the end, it strikes us, much more than it may seem at first sight to gain. As distinguished from the supernatural, in the old theological sense—which is at the same time here also the popular sense—the natural includes in its

conception a great deal more than the simply material and physical. The term is often used indeed to express the idea of difference from the moral; but never so as to refer this last to the supernatural. When *that* distinction is to be expressed, the moral itself is made to fall at once, along with the physical, into the economy of nature. This includes in its constitution mind as well as matter, self-determining forces or powers as well as simply passive chains of cause and effect. Man belongs primarily to the present world; he is incorporated into it organically from his birth; his relations to it are part of its proper system, quite as much as the conditions and laws of things below him. True, he possesses in himself, at the same time, the capacity of a higher life, original and constitutional relations to an order of existence far more glorious than the present world, the powers of which must be brought to bear upon him in a most real way, if he is to fulfil at last the great purpose of his creation. But this does not of itself lift him out of the order of nature. It shows only how truly he is in it, as needing thus the power of the supernatural, under an objective form, to perfect his existence in that higher view.

We are by no means satisfied, in the next place, with Dr. Bushnell's theory of the origin of evil. Sin, if we understand him rightly, is not only a bad possibility in any such world as ours, but a tremendous necessity. He holds indeed that our first parents were created in a state of "constituent perfection," having an inward fitness and disposition for good, that served to carry them toward it spontaneously without or before deliberation. But holiness in such form can have no sufficient strength or security. "Deliberation, when it comes, as come it must, will be the inevitable fall of it; and then when the side of counsel in them is sufficiently instructed by that fall, and the bitter sorrow it yields, and the holy freedom is restored, it may be or become an eternally enduring principle. Spontaneity in good, without counsel, is weak; counsel and deliberative choice, without spontaneity, are only a character begun; issued in

spontaneity, they are the solid reality of everlasting good." It does not help the case materially, to say that there was no positive ground or cause for sin in man's nature; and that our first parents fell by their own free choice. The difficulty is, that their free choice is supposed here to be so circumstanced, in the way of "privative conditions," as to be absolutely shut up to this conclusion and no other. "The *certainty* of their sin," we are told, "is originally involved in their spiritual training as powers." Their condition privative was such as to involve "their *certain* lapse into evil."

Sin is made to be thus a necessary transitional stage, in the process of full moral development. The condition of man in Paradise was not, and could not be, a direct onward movement in its own form to confirmed holiness, and so to glory, honor, and eternal life. It was necessary that he should taste evil, in order to become afterwards intelligently and resolutely good. His innocence could be strengthened into its full ripe virtue, only by being required to descend into the rough arena of the world through the fall, for the purpose of needful discipline and probation. This is not a new thought by any means. We recognize in it the famillar face of a speculation, which in one form or another has made itself altogether common in much of the thinking of modern Germany. But we do not consider it for this reason any the less wrong. It agrees not with the old doctrine of the Church on the subject; and the natural sense of the Bible is against it. It turns the Garden of Eden into a mere allegory or myth. It seats the necessity of sin in the very constitution of the world itself; a view, which goes at once to overthrow its character as sin, making it indeed the fruit of man's freedom in form, but so conditioning this freedom, that it is found to be only another name at last for what is in fact inevitable fate.

Dr. Bushnell carries his view of the certainty of man's fall so far, as to hold that the entire natural constitution of the world was ordered and established by God from the beginning with reference to that terrible fact; which in

such view, therefore, could be no doubtful or uncertain contingency in any sense, but must be considered rather as forming from the very start the fixed central pivot and hinge, we may say, on which the whole plan of the world was made to turn. Sin thus has its disordering consequences in the natural creation, not simply as they are found coming *after* it in time; but also, on a much broader scale it would seem, as they have been made in God's plan to go before it, in the form of dispositions and arrangements contrived prospectively to anticipate its advent, and to lead over to it finally as the full interpretation of their own sense. Even the long geologic ages, stretching away back of the Adamic creation, are taken to be prelusive throughout in this way of the surely coming fact of sin. "This whole tossing, rending, recomposing process, that we call geology," our author tells us, "symbolizes evidently, as in highest reason it should, the grand spiritual catastrophe, and Christian new creation, of man; which, both together, comprehend the problem of mind, and so the final causes or last ends of all God's works. What we see, is the beginning conversing with the end, and Eternal Forethought reaching across the tottering mountains and boiling seas, to unite beginning and end together. So that we may hear the grinding layers of the rocks singing harshly:

> Of man's first disobedience and the fruit
> Of that forbidden tree—

and all the long eras of desolation, and refitted bloom and beauty, represented in the registers of the world, are but the epic in stone of man's great history, before the time."

On all this, we venture here no particular criticism. The subject, in the hands of Dr. Bushnell, is full of imagination and poetry, while it is made to overflow at the same time with rich suggestive thought. Our great embarrassment with it is, that, by making the universal order of the world dependent centrally upon the fall of man, and the introduction of sin, it makes this no less necessary than the geologic cataclysms, that owe their existence to it anticipatively so many ages before. Calvin's supralapsarianism,

and the pantheistic world-progress of Hegel, seem to us always to run out here to the same conclusion, a Manichean notion of sin on the one hand, and as the necessary counterpart of this, a Gnostic conception of redemption on the other.

Through whatever stages of imperfection and disorder our world may have passed previously to the Mosaic creation, described in the first chapter of Genesis, we know that it was then at least pronounced by God himself to be in all respects "very good." There can be no doubt, too, that this goodness, in the view of the sacred narrative, was held to consist in its full correspondence with the nature of man as he stood before the fall. The world was good, not in the light of a penitentiary prepared beforehand to suit the circumstances of his case in a state of sin, but as a fit theatre for the free harmonious development of his life in a state of innocence. How the fall wrought to disturb this original order, is of course a great mystery. It may have been largely by changes and privations induced upon the nature of man himself, causing the world to be in its relations to him something wholly different from what it would be if he were not thus hurled down from his first estate, and making it impossible for him even to conceive now of what might be comprehended for him in any such normal order. One thing is certain; had he continued sinless, the law of death, as it prevails in nature, could not have extended itself to his person; and how much of superiority this might have involved, in other respects, to the constitutional vanity and misery of the world as we now find it, no one may pretend surely to say.

Dr. Bushnell's idea of the necessity of sin extends logically to all worlds. Even the good angels, spoken of in the Scriptures, he tells us, "for aught that appears, have all been passed through and brought up out of a fall, as the redeemed of mankind will be." The celebrated Christian philosopher, Richard Rothe—one of the profoundest thinkers of the age—adopts the same thought, we remember, in his Theological Ethics. We let it pass here without further remark.

We have been somewhat surprised to find Dr. Bushnell denying also the proper personality of Satan. He allows the existence of evil spirits; but is not willing to admit the idea of their organization under any single head. Satan, he tells us, is a collective term simply, designating "the all or total of bad minds and powers." This is neither biblical, we think, nor ecclesiastical—though it *be* supported, curiously enough, by the authority of *Davenport*, "the ablest theologian of all the New England Fathers." It detracts also seriously, in our opinion, from the objective realness, and full historical significance, of the work of redemption, regarded as an actual supernatural conflict between the powers of light and the powers of darkness. A real personal Satan seems necessary, to bring out in full relief the idea of a real personal Christ. And so far as the danger of any Manichean dualism is concerned, we do not see that we are brought so nigh to it by any means in this way, as by the hypothesis of our respected author himself; which, as we have seen, makes sin to be a necessary thing—a fact *sure* to come to pass—in the very constitution of the world itself. It carries indeed to our ear, we must confess, a very Zoroastrish sound, when we are told up and down, that evil is "a bad possibility that environs God from eternity, waiting to become a fact, and certain to become a fact, whenever the opportunity is given;" so that, "the moment God creates a realm of powers, the bad possibility as certainly becomes a bad actuality—an outbreaking evil, or empire of evil, in created spirits, according to their order."

We have said, that the great merit of Dr. Bushnell's book, as a plea for the supernatural, is its Christological character. Its argument centres in Jesus Christ; whose whole personality, as we have it portrayed in the Gospel, is shown with great beauty and force to be an altogether superhuman fact, and such a self-evidencing miracle in its own nature, as may well be considered sufficient to flood with the light of heavenly demonstration the universal *kosmos* of the new creation. And yet we do not feel after all, that

enough is made still of the significance in this view of the great "mystery of godliness," as related to the supernatural on the one side and to the world of nature on the other.

The revelation of the supernatural in and by Christ is not of one kind, with the revelation of it in any other way. Nature in its own order needs the supernatural, reaches after it, and through the human spirit aspires toward it continually as the necessary outlet and complement of its last wants. This aspiration, however, is in itself something negative merely, which as such can have no power of course ever to grasp the supernatural or to bring it down to its own sphere; for what nature might so fetch into itself by powers of its own would be no longer *super*-natural; the negative want or nisus here must be met, by a positive self-representation of its object from the other side. In these circumstances, there is room for imaginary or false relations to thrust themselves in as substitutes for the true. Men may invest their own speculative fancies and dreams —the shadowy projections of their spiritual nature itself reaching forth toward the dark void—with a sort of spurious objectivity; thus creating for themselves whole worlds of religion, that shall be found to mimic and caricature the truth in its proper form. Again, the powers of the invisible world may play into the economy of nature in an irregular, abnormal way, through Satanic inlets, offering themselves to the inward craving of the human spirit, as the very presence and sense of the supernatural which it needs for its perfection, and so hurrying it away, by the force of its religious instincts themselves, into a still more gloomy region of horrible unrealities and lies. To this sphere belong the sorcery, magic, and witchcraft of all ages, as well as the oracles and wonders of the heathen world generally, as far as it may be necessary to admit their more than natural character; and we have no hesitation, in referring to it also—as Dr. Bushnell does too—the so called "spiritual manifestations" of our own day, on the supposition of their being what they pretend to be and not mere tricks of jugglery; a question which it is not necessary

here to discuss. The world, however, God be praised, has not been left hopelessly to the dominion of these phantoms and lies, growing out of such false relations to the supernatural. The truth has descended into it, under its own proper form. This is the idea of Revelation.

In one view, nature itself is a divine revelation. A supernatural presence underlies it, and works through it, at every point. But still as man now is, he has no power to come by this to any right knowledge of God, and much less to any firm and steady apprehension of a higher order of life in his presence. Hence an actual coming down of God into the world under a wholly new form, becomes the proper full sense of the supernatural as required now to meet our wants. Revelation, so understood, is a single fact; announcing its own advent by heavenly oracles and signs, making room for itself more and more by preliminary heaven-appointed dispensations, from the time of Adam down to the time of John the Baptist; but bursting forth at last, in its whole reality and glory, only in the ever-adorable mystery of the Incarnation. The supernatural in Christ thus is not in one line simply with the supernatural exhibited in previous divine revelations, a fact ranking high and conclusive among other facts of like superhuman order; it is the organic root rather of all true revelation from the beginning of the world; the one absolute truth in this form, which, coming in the fulness of time, makes good finally the sense of all previous oracles and outshinings from behind the veil, disclosing the real ground of them in its own presence. And being so related to what went before in the way of prophetical word and type, with still more certainty must the mystery be organically joined with all that comes after it, in the progressive unfolding of the Christian salvation. The Incarnation constitutes the gospel—being in its very nature a new revelation of God in the world, by which the life of heaven is made to unite itself with the life of earth, in a real abiding way, so as to bring the supernatural home to men in a form fully answerable to their inmost wants. In such view, it is the

beginning of a new order of existence, the principle of a new creation, which in the nature of the case must hold under an objective, historical character, as something different from the world in its simply natural constitution, on to the end of time. This is the old Patristic idea of the Holy Catholic Church; and it is not difficult surely to see how, in the light of the subject as thus explained, so much account should have been made of it from the first, as being absolutely necessary for the full carrying out of the Christian mystery to its proper end.

We have the feeling, as we have said, that Dr. Bushnell's system of the supernatural, with all its Christological merit, fails somehow after all to lay hold of the full significance of the Incarnation, in the broad organic view now mentioned. In such way, we mean, as to make this, not merely the greatest of all arguments for the supernatural in a general view, but the absolute whole revelation of it, in the only form in which it can ever be truly and steadily objective to faith, and practically efficient for the purposes of redemption; so that all relations to it, all communications with it, on the outside of this great Mystery of Godliness, can never be anything better than relative only, dream-like, apparitional, or it may be absolutely magical, demoniacal, and false. For Rationalism, it should ever be borne in mind, has two sides, two opposite poles of unbelief, that are forever playing into each other with wonderful readiness and ease; an abstract naturalism on the one hand, that owns no reality higher than the present world; and then an abstract spiritualism on the other hand, by which the sense of the supernatural is not allowed to come to any real union with the sense of the natural in the way of faith, but is made to float over it fantastically in the way of mere Gnostic imagination. The one absolute Truth, according to St. John, as against both these antichristian extremes, is the real coming of Christ in the flesh (1 John 4: 1–3); in making earnest with which under such view, it is not easy to see how faith should not feel itself constrained to make like earnest also with the old doctrine of the Church.

This doctrine, we are sorry to say, struggles in vain throughout Dr. Bushnell's book to come to its proper clear and full expression ; and the want of it, in our view, is a serious defect in his otherwise admirable Christological argument. He shows indeed at various points the power of churchly ideas—for all profound thinking on the historical significance of Christ's person *must* run more or less that way ; he is ready enough too, of course, to acknowledge the existence of the Church in the general New England sense; but the conception of the Church, as it is made to be an article of faith, a first principle or ground element of Christianity, in the Apostles' Creed, and in all the ancient Creeds, has seemingly no place in his system whatever.

Thus the Gospel seems to be regarded by him too commonly, in the light of a constitution or fact qualifying the natural condition of the world generally in a supernatural way, and setting it in new relations to God within its old order of life ; in virtue of which, it may be supposed capable then of coming at once, on its own level, within the range and scope of the powers of redemption, flowing around it spiritually at all times like the air of heaven. Whereas the mystery of the new creation in Christ would appear plainly to require, that we should conceive of it, not as any such system of heavenly possibilities added to the world in its general natural character, but as an objective constitution rather, having place in the world under a wholly different form, and carrying in itself relations and powers altogether peculiar, and not to be found anywhere beyond its own limits ; an order of supernatural grace, into which men must be introduced first of all, (the old ecclesiastical idea of re-birth through the sacrament of baptism,) by an outward "obedience of faith," in order that they may come into the full use afterwards of its quickening and saving help. Any such view must necessarily exclude Dr. Bushnell's suggestion, that a regenerate life may be capable of passing, like the corruption of the race, by natural propagation, "under the well known laws of physiol-

ogy," from parents to children; as it demands also a material qualification of a good deal that he says besides, on the subject of Christian experience, the work of the Spirit, and the new creation in Christ Jesus.

It is owing to this want of ecclesiastical feeling, no doubt, that Dr. Bushnell falls in so readily with the stereotyped Puritanic way of thinking in regard to the historical Church of past ages, by which it is made to be from the beginning, a systematic falling away from the proper sense of the Gospel, in all its points of difference from the prevalent spiritualism of modern times. In one of his chapters, we have an argument to show, that "the world is governed supernaturally in the interest of Christianity;" which, carried out in any sort of consistency with itself, would seem to involve necessarily a powerful presumption in favor of the old Catholic Church—the only form, in which, by general acknowledgment now, the truth of Christianity was maintained, through long ages, against all manner of infidelities and heresies seeking its destruction. But our author's theory will not allow the argument in any such way as that—he contrives to find here a wheel within a wheel, an esoteric *under-sense*, by which the outward complexion and first impression of God's providence are made to be one thing, and its hidden ulterior meaning another thing altogether. We are gravely told, accordingly, that Christianity *must* "go into a grand process of corruption at first," to make room for its own regeneration finally to a higher and better life. And so if the course of events, century after century, fall in concurrently with the march of Christianity in this false shape, verifying apparently in the fortunes of the Catholic Church the symbol of the bush that burned with fire and yet was not consumed, we are not to be moved by it at all as proving anything in favor of the Church, but to read in it on the contrary only a profound ordering of God's providence, designed to open the way for its ultimate confusion and defeat. Need we say that the providential, or historical, argument for Christianity, in any such form as this, is shorn of all force, and turn-

ed into a mere arbitrary conceit, which is capable of being used ingeniously with as much effect one way as another?

We have been pleased to find, that Dr. Bushnell does not shrink from confessing the continuation of the power of miracles in the Church, making them to be on fit occasions both possible and actual, from the first century down to the present time. We have long felt, that the popular notion on the subject, which supposes them to have continued for about three centuries after Christ, and then to have ceased entirely, is both against reason and without any sort of proper support in history. The proof for miracles *after* the third century is altogether more full and clear, than the proof for miracles in the second and third centuries themselves. The real possibility of them, moreover, would seem to lie in the very conception of Christianity, considered as an order of supernatural powers enduringly present in the world to the end of time; so that one is at a loss to understand, what kind of faith in it *they* can have, who make a merit of mocking and scouting every miraculous pretension in its name, as being at once, and of itself, the surest evidence of gross imposture or blind superstition. With such irrational and irreligious skepticism our Hartford divine has no sympathy. He believes in the continuation of the power of miracles in the Church, down even to our own day; and more than that, he brings forward quite a number of what he considers well authenticated examples of the miraculous in modern times, which have fallen in some measure under his own observation. It is curious to read his chapter on this subject.

Here again, however, we are struck with the *unchurchly* spirit of his thinking. The old ecclesiastical miracles are not wholly to his taste; their ecclesiasticism at least seems to be counted a hindrance to their credibility, more than a help. His faith in such things appears to breathe most free, when it passes out of that order, and is allowed to expatiate at large among wonders more or less extra-ecclesiastical in their form and character. We shall not pretend, of course, to enter here into any examination of his

cases. We must say, however, that Church miracles in the proper sense—miracles, we mean, as mediated by the idea of the Church in the old Augustinian view—are vastly more respectable, in our eyes, than any such class of examples under a different and more general type. We question, indeed, if it be possible to make earnest with the belief of miracles at all, except in connection with some believing apprehension of the mystery of the Church, in the sense of the Apostles' Creed. Out of that order, the supernatural as related to the present world, would seem to carry with it always, even under its best and most reliable manifestations, a certain character of Gnostic unreality, making it to be no proper object for steady Christian faith. We have been much struck with the frank confession of Dr. Bushnell himself, after all his examples, in regard to this point. "As regards the general truth," he tells us, "that supernatural facts, such as healings, tongues, and other gifts, may as well be manifested now as at any former time, and that there never has been a formal discontinuance, I am perfectly satisfied. I know no proof to the contrary, that appears to me to have a straw's weight. And yet, when I come to the question of being in such gifts, or of receiving into easy credit those who appear to be, I acknowledge that for some reason, either because of some latent subjection to the conventionalities of philosophy, or to the worse conventionalities of sin, belief does not follow, save in a somewhat faltering and equivocal way." But so it is, he adds, with many great questions of God and immortality. "The arguments are good and clear, but, for some reason, they do not make faith, and we are still surprised to find, in our practice, that we only doubtfully believe. To believe these supernatural things, in the form of particular facts, is certainly difficult; and how conscious are we, as we set ourselves to the questions, of the weakness of our vacillations! Pardon us, Lord, that when we make so much of mere credibilities and rationalities of opinion, we are yet so slow to believe that what we have shown to be credible and rational, is actually coming to pass."

Verily, it *is* a great thing to have faith, even as a grain of mustard seed; to be able to own and embrace, not merely the thought of the supernatural in a natural way, but the real presence of it in its own order; to hold the proper verity of the Gospel, not in the form of doctrine only, or supposed inward experiences, but in the form of full objective, historical fact. To be able to say the Creed, in its own meaning and sense. To stand before the Man Jesus, and confess, with more than natural knowledge, as Peter did: "*Thou* art the Christ, the Son of the living God." To believe that "Christ is come in the flesh," with all the necessary antecedents, concomitants, and consequents of such a revelation; his birth of the Virgin, full of grace, and blessed among women; his miracles in the days of his flesh; his resurrection and ascension; his new presence in the world by the Spirit; the supernatural order of the Church, set over against the order of nature, and comprehending in itself the powers of his resurrection life to the end of time. This is the Gospel, as we find it preached everywhere in the Acts of the Apostles—as it underlies all the New Testament Epistles—as it animated the spirit of martyrs and confessors in the first Christian ages; and the power of believing it, we repeat, is indeed so great a thing, that all worldly advantages in comparison, may well seem to be both poor and mean. Such faith, from the very nature of the case, must be itself supernatural—the power of passing beyond nature, so as to lay hold of things heavenly and divine in their own higher order and sphere. It must come into the soul then in and through the constitution of grace itself, under its character of objective distinction from the constitution of man's merely natural life. There may be actings of the organ or faculty, indeed, on the outside of this; but these will be always in a more or less Gnostic and unreal way; forms of believing, we may say, filled as yet with no proper contents of faith; the virtue can come to full exercise in the bosom of the Christian mystery alone. And what now if the standing form of this mystery in the world be still the Church, as it was

held to be in the beginning? Could faith do its office, in that case, while denying, despising, ignoring, or overlooking its claims? One use of his argument for the supernatural Dr. Bushnell finds in this, that it provides a place and a plea for the "positive institutions of religion," as he calls them—meaning by these, church organization, the sacraments, the Sabbath, the Bible, the office of the ministry, &c.—which are allowed to be "falling rapidly into disrespect, as if destined finally to be quite lost or sunk in oblivion." This fact itself he ascribes to the growth and pervading influence of naturalism. But may we not reverse the order, and make the loss of belief—we will not say in the positive institutions of Christianity—but in the Christian Church itself, one large cause of the reigning decay of faith in a wider view? To restore the supernatural to its general rights, then, nothing would be needed so much, first of all, as a resuscitation of faith in the Church. Then, also, any argument for the supernatural, any plea for the Christological in its sound and right form, to be of full force and effect in the end, must be at the same time ecclesiastical also, or, in other words, an argument for the old doctrine of the Church, as it stands enshrined in the early Creeds. Is it too much to hope, that Dr. Bushnell's earnest and active mind may yet be turned to the subject, under this profoundly interesting view?

Lancaster, Pa. J. W. N.

ART. III.—THE RELIGIOUS CHARACTER OF WASHINGTON.*

THE subject of this article is called by LORD BROUGHAM, "the GREATEST *man of our own, or any age.*" "It will," he adds, "be the duty of the historian and the sage, in all ages, to let no occasion pass, of commemorating this illustrious man; and until time shall be no more, will a test of the progress which our race has made in wisdom and virtue, be derived from the veneration paid to the immortal name of Washington." This ingenuous and merited tribute to distinguished worth, will ever meet a cheering response in the heart of every true American. It stands associated, in the past and memorable history of our republic, with prerogatives and blessings, unsurpassed, by any people under heaven.

In the contemplation of our present greatness and preeminent civil and religious privileges, our thoughts recur not only to Him, who is the source of all good, but to the men also by whom the foundation of this greatness was laid and through whom these privileges were conferred. We are led back to that period in our country's history, when our patriot fathers bought these blessings with their blood,—when not only vigorous youth rushed forth to meet in deadly combat the invading foe, but the aged and infirm, as if suddenly inspired with the ardor and strength of manhood, hastened to the rescue of their precious heritage from the grasp of their oppressors. Among the noble worthies of that dark and mournful period, there looms into view the form of him, to whom it will ever be our pride and love to award this praise: "*First in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.*"

The illustrious founder of our great republic possessed a

* For the authorities quoted in the preparation of this article, the reader is referred to Dr. Shroeder's "Maxims of Washington," 1855, and Weems' life of Washington.

character far higher, however, than it is in the power of mere *human* excellence to develop. It must ever be regarded as a matter of incalculable importance, and a most gracious allotment of Divine Providence, that our beloved Washington was a man who feared God and loved righteousness. He did not only present to his countrymen a singular instance of military valor and glory—of unexampled statesmanship—of unbending integrity and disinterested patriotism, but also of genuine and unaffected piety. Washington was emphatically a *Christian* hero, and a *Christian* statesman. Here lay the secret of his true greatness.

It is well observed by one of his biographers, that "when the children of years to come, hearing his great name re-echoed from every lip, shall say to their fathers: 'what was it that raised Washington to such a height of glory,' let them be told that it was his great talents, constantly guided and guarded by religion."

Impressed with a due appreciation of the true character of this great and good man, the late *Earl of Buchan* said of him: "I recommend the constant remembrance of the moral and political maxims, conveyed to its citizens by the Father and Founder of the United States. It seems to me that *such maxims and such advice ought to be engraved on every* FORUM *or* PLACE OF COMMON ASSEMBLY *among the people, and read by parents, teachers and guardians, to their children and pupils, so that true* RELIGION, *and* VIRTUE, *its inseparable attendant, may be imbibed by the rising generation to remote ages.*" Such are the sentiments cherished, and associated with his character by all the wise and the good, as far as his name is known;—and the light and influence of his noble qualities, will not only illuminate and bless the land he loved and served so well, but the remotest bounds of our widespread race, in the onward progress of civilization and religion.

Washington did not owe his greatness so much to any one particular trait of character of towering preëminence, as to a happy combination and adjustment of many intel-

lectual and moral qualities; and which, by a most beautiful harmony of all his purposes and acts, whether in private or in public life, in the cabinet, or in the field, in peace or war;—were all consecrated to the sacred cause of freedom. The *remotest* thought of self-aggrandizement he repelled as a demon intruder, and ever cultivated the most sincere and unaffected devotion to the prosperity of his country. At this shrine he laid, as a willing tribute, his *all;*—his talents—his virtues—his prayers. In every act of his life, whether in private or public, he was guided by a calm, sound, and comprehensive judgment, and sustained by an unbending integrity; and the height of his noble ambition was the true happiness of men.

This uniform and uncompromising devotion of every energy, thought and purpose, to the well-being of his race, to the last hour of his life, must be attributed to the all controlling power of the religion of Christ—that religion which breaks the iron fetters of sin, and restores man, in a measure at least, to his primeval freedom and harmony with his Maker. For the Christian religion is the power of Him in whom dwells the fulness of the Godhead bodily —of Him who is the Personal *Truth* and the Personal *Life;* the true and only refuge of the soul, enslaved by the common depravity of our fallen nature.

The religious character of Washington does not indeed appear with special prominence in the way of *outward* parade or show. He regarded religion or Christian piety, as the sacred treasure of the heart—a holy living principle, that should manifest itself rather in *actions* than in words. It clearly appears in every step of his history, that he cherished an abiding sense of his responsibilities to his Maker, and subordinated all he did to His authority, whether of a public or private character, to the extent of his sense of right. Divine revelation was the source from which his code of ethics was drawn, to control and direct his actions. *Religion*, not *experience* simply, was the lamp by which his feet were guided. Its dictates, he followed with silent modesty, just as the sun in the heavens, noiseless as the

sleeping dead, pursues his steady way, yet moves all nature, and perpetually new-creates the world, and decks the mountains and vales with living green. This, we think, is an apt similitude of the subject of our reflections. Without stir or commotion, filled and animated by an influence drawn from a higher world, and a character "made luminous by a Christian faith," he did not only impress and move society by what he *did*, but by what he *was*. The grandeur and moral splendor of his *character*, were ever adding to his active efforts, an element of *silent* power, which was the real and the chief cause of their efficiency. He moved and led, by the awe-inspiring and commanding dignity, which appeared in his conduct and ingenuous spirit. That humility or a modest and unobtrusive reserve, was a fixed and cherished trait in his character, is attested by the whole tenor of his life. Miss Custis, who, for twenty years, was an inmate of his family, recalling in after years, the scenes of her childhood, writes: "He was a silent, thoughtful man. He spoke little generally; never of himself. I never heard him relate a single act of his life during the war."* Mr. Elkanah Watson, an experienced traveller and close observer of men and manners, observes in relation to a visit to Mt. Vernon: "Conversing for a full hour with Washington, after all the family retired, he modestly waived all allusions to the events in which he had acted so glorious and conspicuous a part."* "I know no man," observes the late Bishop White, "who so carefully guarded against discoursing of himself, or of his acts, or of anything that pertained to him; and it has occasionally occurred to me when in his company, that, if a stranger to his person were present, he would never have known from anything said by him, that he was conscious of having distinguished himself in the eye of the world." In his religious professions, he maintained a like modest reserve, exemplifying his religious belief in his *actions*, and in a *life* so gloriously devoted to the universal well-being of society.

* Irwing's Life of Washington, Vol. 4.

That the religious character of Washington was marred by the imperfections and frailties of erring humanity, is readily conceded, but these are materially modified, when account is taken of the comparatively low state of practical religion in the period in which he lived, and also the secularizing character of his trying and eventful mission. Still, however imposing his career upon the field of strife, with its fearful conflicts and brilliant victories, or in the civil councils of the nation, his *religious* character, may ever and justly be regarded his chief and crowning glory.

That Washington evinced marked religious tendencies in his early youth, his early manuscripts bear decisive testimony.

His early love of *truth* is proverbial. It is recorded of him as a mark of imperishable honor, that he was never known to lie. In disputes among the companions of his boyhood, about a question of fact, his verdict was the end of all controversy.

Among his early papers is found a transcript of an advent hymn, indicating the religious tendencies of his childhood, beginning with these lines:

> "Assist me, sacred muse, to sing the morn
> On which the Saviour of mankind was born."

In the thirteenth year of his age, he recorded a list of *rules* or *maxims*, for the regulation of his conduct, among which are the following:

"When you speak of God, or his attributes, let it be seriously and in reverence."

"Endeavor to keep alive in your bosom that little divine spark, called conscience."

These fundamental principles of all true piety and virtue, *conscientiousness*, and a profound *reverence* for the great Jehovah, attended him through the whole of his eventful and useful life, whether in the quiet home circle, or in its most active and busy scenes.

In his first military campaigns, when yet a young man, such was his sense of dependence upon the divine interposition, that he insisted upon the daily worship of God in

his camp, and in the temporary absence of the chaplain, would frequently read the Scriptures and offer prayer with his regiment. Such a service for the army, was, in his view, a vital interest, and in pressing its claims, with the proper authorities, he urged it, with the remark, that "the blessing and protection of heaven are at all times necessary, but especially in times of public distress and danger."

For the morality of the soldiery under his command, he was deeply solicitous, and used his best endeavors to correct any prevailing immoralities. Accordingly we find in one of his military orders, a strict and decided prohibition of profane swearing, instructing his officers to punish all such offenders with twenty-five lashes, without the formalities of a court martial. For a repetition of the offence, the punishment was ordered to be increased. His profound reverence for his Maker, and his sense of dependence upon His constant interposition, could not regard the profaning of His name with other than feelings of horror and unaffected sorrow. His own tongue never lisped that great and holy Name but with trembling awe, and he ever used his best efforts to inspire his companions in arms, with a like hallowed reverence.

Against the monster evil, "gaming," he bore an equally firm and decisive testimony, and in his military orders entered against this vice his earnest prohibition. We here give his own language upon this subject: "All officers and soldiers, are positively forbid playing at cards, or other games of chance. At this time of public distress, men may find enough to do, in the service of their God and their country, without abandoning themselves to vice and immorality. Gaming of every kind, is expressly forbidden, as being the foundation of evil, and the cause of many a brave and gallant officer's ruin. It is a vice which is productive of every possible evil; equally injurious to the morals and health of its votaries. It is the child of Avarice, the brother of Iniquity, and the father of Mischief. It has been the ruin of many worthy families, the loss of many a man's honor, and the cause of suicide. To all

those who enter the lists, it is equally fascinating. The *successful* gamester pushes his good fortune, till it is overtaken by a reverse. The *losing* gamester, in hopes of retrieving past fortunes, goes on, from bad to worse, till grown desperate, he pushes at every thing, and loses his all." Thus Washington endeavored, by every means in his power, to discountenance this, and other vices, especially profanity and drunkenness, and ever sought to inspire, in his officers and soldiers, a laudable emulation in the practice of virtue, and a faithful performance of duty in the service of their country.

Washington was a firm believer in a special overruling providence, a belief which he exemplified in all his actions. We find him constantly referring all he undertook to the *Allwise* disposer of all events, with the confidence that he would lead to such issues as would best promote the divine glory, and the good of men.

"I flatter myself," he says, "that a superintending Providence is ordering everything for the best, and that in due time all will end well. The terminations of Providence are always wise, often inscrutable; and though its decrees appear to bear hard upon us at times, they are, nevertheless, meant for gracious purposes." "Again he says: Providence has heretofore taken us up, when all other means and hope seemed to be departing from us. In this will I confide." During his Presidency, we find in his public documents many instances of his humble acknowledgment of the divine interposition. We select the following: "Although guided by our excellent constitution, in the discharge of official duties, and actuated through the whole course of our public life, solely by a wish to promote the best interests of our country; yet without the beneficial interposition of the Supreme Ruler of the universe, we could not have reached the distinguished situation which we have attained with such unprecedented rapidity. To Him, therefore, should we bow with gratitude and reverence, and endeavor to merit a continuance of his special favors. The success which hath hitherto attended our

united efforts, we owe to the gracious interposition of heaven, and to that interposition let us gratefully ascribe the praise of victory and the blessing of peace."

In tendering this homage to the great Author of all good, he was not influenced simply by a courteous regard for the feelings of a professedly Christian people, but by a sense of conscious dependence upon, and living faith in God,—a reliance, which he found his best support, in the trials through which he was called to pass. For when tossed upon the waves of an excited and oppressed people—when faction and strife were agitating many portions of the country—when wisdom and courage and even *patriotism* seemed to fail, and the whole nation recoiled from the yawning abyss that threatened to engulf it, his soul found an all-sufficient refuge in that Almighty being, to whose keeping he had piously committed the cause of his wronged and bleeding country. "*God is my hope,*" is inscribed upon all the acts of his civil and military career. To *His* favor alone, in whose hands are the destinies of nations, he looked for success, in the momentous interests he was called, by the voice of his country, to defend. With a firm confidence in the rectitude of his country's cause, he says: "We leave the event to Him who speaks the fate of nations, in humble reliance that, as His omniscient eye taketh note even of the sparrow that falleth to the ground, so he will not withdraw his countenance from a people, who humbly ARRAY THEMSELVES UNDER HIS BANNER, in defence of the noblest principles with which he hath adorned humanity."

But we follow Washington to a still higher eminence of moral and religious greatness. He was a worthy communicant member and honored vestryman of the Christian Church. His was not the religion of nature merely, but the religion of the Son of God. In a spirit of becoming meekness and modest reserve, he observed the ordinances and duties of a Christian profession. It is stated by Miss Custis, to whom we have already referred, that he always received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper before the revolution. During the vicissitudes and turmoils of the

revolutionary period, opportunities for the enjoyment of this solemnity were but rarely afforded, nor could the mind be easily composed for so sacred an approach to God, amid the din and excitement of a military campaign. Still, this service was not entirely unobserved by him, even during the progress of sanguinary hostilities. While encamped at Morristown, New Jersey, he sought and obtained permission to join in the celebration of the holy supper in the Presbyterian congregation of that place, under the pastorate of the Rev. Dr. Jones. Although a member of another branch of the Christian Church, the Protestant Episcopal, he did not only evince by this act, his regard for a divinely instituted ordinance of our holy religion, and his love to a crucified Saviour, but likewise his liberal sentiments and noble charity towards Christians of other confessions. Washington was no bigot, though ardently attached to the Church, in which he was born and reared. Upon this subject are found the following sentiments, among his public records: "It would ill become me to conceal the joy I have felt in perceiving the fraternal affection, which appears to increase every day, among the friends of genuine religion. It affords edifying prospects indeed, to see Christians of every denomination dwell together in more charity, and conduct themselves in respect to each other with a more Christian-like spirit than ever they have done in any former age, or in any nation. Being no bigot myself to any mode of worship, I am disposed to indulge the professors of Christianity in the Church with that road to heaven, which to them may seem the most direct, plainest, easiest, and the least liable to exception; and I trust the people of every denomination, who demean themselves as good citizens, will have occasion to be convinced, that I shall always strive to be a faithful and impartial patron of genuine and vital religion." Washington cherished a charity too noble and expansive to harbor for a moment, that ungracious and *frosty* exclusiveness which cries: "*The people of the Lord, the people of the Lord are we.*"

We must not pass unnoticed, his profound regard for, and constant attendance upon, the public worship of the sanctuary. The Rev. Mr. Massey, of whose parish Washington was an active vestryman, says: "I never knew so constant an attendant on church as Washington. And his behavior in the house of God was ever so deeply reverential, that it produced the happiest effect on my congregation, and greatly assisted me in my moralizing labors. No company ever withheld him from church. I have often been at Mt. Vernon on the Sabbath morning, when his breakfast table was filled with guests. But to him they furnished no pretext to neglect his God and losing the satisfaction of setting a good example. For, instead of staying at home, out of false complaisance to them, he used constantly to invite them to accompany him." Indeed such was his ardent attachment to the public worship of God, that during the war, when he could be possibly spared from camp, he would frequently ride ten or twelve miles to participate in the services of the sanctuary.

In his private communion with God, his example is no less illustrious. In the privacy of his closet, Washington implored that Almighty aid which was so signally vouchsafed in the achievment of the liberties of our country. It is stated by his private secretary, Mr. Lewis, that he "often found him accidentally in his library, in a kneeling posture, engaged in his devotions, with a Bible open before him." And during the time of his military service, it was his constant habit to retire for secret prayer. We have the testimony of several of his officers, "that on sudden and unexpected visits into his tent, he has more than once been found on his knees at his devotions." And not unlike his blessed Lord, often

> "Cold mountains and the midnight air,
> Witnessed the fervor of his prayer."

Most truly has it been said, that "the independence of our country was laid, not only in valor, patriotism, and wisdom, but in *prayer*."

We have thus given a hasty, but we believe a truthful

sketch of the religious character of the father and defender of our republic. Should our picture seem to any to be overdrawn, this is our apology: it is the picture of WASHINGTON; of *Washington*, who, when he had served his country with a patriotism and rectitude of purpose unparalleled in the annals of history; of *Washington*, who, when he had completed his mission, and felt that the "silver cord of life was loosing, raised himself upon his bed of death, and cast a look of benignity and silent adieu on all around him, then composed his limbs, closed his eyes, and folding his arms upon his bosom, expiring, said: "FATHER OF MERCIES, TAKE ME TO THYSELF!" How truly has it been pronounced by the wisest and best men of every age, that "there never was a truly great man without religion." Men may be learned, and talented, and brave, but without religion, they are "wickedly wise, and madly brave." Napoleon was one of the bravest and most distinguished warriors the world ever beheld, and of brilliant and varied talents, but for want of genuine religion, and blinded by ambition, he mistook the *true* path to glory, and sought to perpetuate his fame and power by severing the indissoluble bond of heaven, and has left to the letter a verification of his own prediction: "Posterity will talk of Washington with reverence, as the founder of a great empire, when *my* name shall be lost in the vortex of revolutions."

Hamilton, who fought by the side of Washington and Lafayette, and stormed the British entrenchments, was brave, and talented, and accomplished, but preferring the praise of men to the praise of God, he had not the courage to say "NO" to a challenge, not less infamous than barbarous. Arnold had won for himself a high military reputation, and had, on this account, committed to his trust, positions of the highest importance to the interests and safety of the contending colonies. But uninfluenced by the holy principles of religion, he sold for British gold, the cause he had so ably defended, and has loaded his name with the execrations of mankind. We repeat, then, the sentiment, that "there never was a truly great man without religion."

It is most emphatically "the one thing needful" for the full development of our powers, and the accomplishment of our true destiny. It is the source of all that is green and enduring—the chart that traces, with unerring exactness, every path of duty, and he that followeth *its* dictates "shall not walk in darkness, but have the light of life." Let the religion of the Son of God abound, and sway the popular and national will, and we shall realize the beatitude of divine revelation: "Blessed is that people, whose God is the Lord." Upon this foundation our free institutions will stand firm, from age to age, until the Prince of *life*, and *truth*, and *love*, shall obtain a universal triumph, and reign King Supreme over all earth's dominions. In this our Washington trusted—in this he triumphed! By emulating his patriotism and exalted virtues, his favored countrymen, will rear to his name a more enduring memorial than a monument of marble.

Carlisle, Pa. A. H. K.

ART. IV.—A DISCOURSE BY DR. RAUCH: EVERY MAN IS THE LORD'S IN LIFE.

"For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. (Rom. 14: 8.)

THE words, which I have just read, stand closely connected with those of the fourth and ninth verses of the same chapter. Paul, with whom every thing depended on faith, on our internal condition, and according to whom only those things which did not proceed from faith were sinful, warned his brethren in Rome, in view of their own errors and mistakes, against condemning their fellow Christians and judging of their personal guilt, saying by way of argument: "Who art thou, that judgest another

man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth." No believer is the master of another, but all are the servants of the Lord, and to Him the judgment is given so that we may fear to see one fall, whilst the Lord holds him up. Since it is the Lord's own care, and since His alone is the power to preserve His servants, it would be arrogant to intrude ourselves, where our aid is not needed. Again, Paul says: "For to this end, Christ both died, and arose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living." Christ, according to the will of God, is the Lord of all that is created; He died and became a citizen of that world over which He must reign in order that His dominion may be absolute. It is, therefore, not only believers, who, being redeemed and saved through the death of Christ, willingly and joyfully acknowledge in Him their Lord and Master, but all nature and every living being in it, and all *men*, with or against their will, are the property of the Lord and will be judged by Him. Though Paul uses the words of the text particularly of the Christian, because he, having been purchased by the blood of Christ, is His who purchased him, and because he, being united to the Lord by faith and love, does not desire to be the servant of any one else, but seeks the centre of all his wishes and actions in Christ—I nevertheless feel myself justified in proving, from the *former* part of my text, that *every man is the Lord's whilst he lives*, and from the *latter* part, that *every man is the Lord's when he dies*.

PART FIRST.

I shall prove,

1.) That *every man whilst he lives* is the Lord's.

2.) That the *believer is the Lord's during life*, though in a sense entirely different from that of men in general.

I.

Every man whilst he lives is the Lord's, *without acknowledging it*. It may be, that the sinner thinks that he is the master of his own life, but he only deceives himself. From the time of his birth till he dies, there is not one moment, not one breath, which he can call entirely his own. He

is called into life, not by his choice and will, but by Him who created all things; he entered this world under certain circumstances, in a certain century, in a certain nation, in a certain family, without having been consulted; he finds himself determined in his life by an education, which he cannot give himself, but for which he depends on those that surround him; by customs and manners; by the degree of cultivation of his nation; by their religious views, their moral character, over none of which he can exercise the slightest control, whilst he is more or less determined in his whole existence by each of them. Even the country in which the Creator has cast his lot, and which by its climate, by its natural productions, by its scenery, by its situation, promotes or impedes our intellectual improvement, our comforts, our privileges as citizens—even the country, where he must live, is assigned to him by that power which reigns over our whole life, forms the chain of circumstances which influences our resolutions and actions and guides us, whilst we imagine ourselves entirely independent.

As man has not given himself his life, so he does not live by his own power, nor does he even know *how he lives.* See what an artificial constitution the body is; how wonderful the organization of the smallest part, of the eye, of the ear, of the head! How fit our limbs are for many uses, how every atom in us works and is active, solicits and feels, beats and moves, and how all is composed to act and feel, to move and live so as to produce one perfect harmony. We are fearfully and wonderfully made! The sinner cannot comprehend this wonderful work of God, much less can he support and maintain it. If one organ ceases its action, the whole organization is deranged; if the heart ceases to beat, his breath stands still. Has the sinner his life in his own power?

This wonderful body, it is true, is at the command of the soul which, present every where, holds together the whole, uses it as it may choose, devises plans, and acts through it. *But is this soul the sinner's?—Does he know what it is?*—Does he know how it acts through nerves and muscles? How its will moves the arm, how the brain says to

the foot: "move,"—"now rest again." How from a mere external excitation thoughts and meditations rise. We think, we live, we breathe, but neither in ourselves, nor through ourselves, but in and through our Lord.

Again: The soul is the power from which a great number of faculties spring forth, which, though many, are nevertheless all of them identical with each other. These faculties, however, modify and limit each other, and the manner in which this is done constitutes the peculiar talents and disposition of every man, so that, though all of us have the same faculties, the same soul, no one of us has a soul in the same manner as the other. The peculiar manner in which the various faculties modify each other in their activity, leaves a certain faculty of the soul more free and more energetic in one man than it is in another, who, having this faculty in a subordinate degree, enjoys the more free use of a different faculty which the former had not in the same degree. I need not prove now, that none of us, by his mere will, can extort from his nature such talents as Providence has denied him; yet how much depends on our natural faculties, on our talents, on our dispositions, for our occupation in life, for the choice of a profession, for our usefulness, for our happiness. *Whence then this difference in our natural capacities?* The Lord of creation has ordered it thus. He needs all kinds of men; He needs the learned and the ignorant, the wise and the foolish, since He, to accomplish His plan, does not look to single actions, but to their connexion and harmony. Whatever our life or our faculties be, they must serve the Lord, though we should not be aware of it.

The sinner is the Lord's *without willing it.* This I shall prove in the next place.

The human race consists of a vast multitude of individuals, of whom some leave this world at all seasons of the year and in all ages of life. Numbers die as children, as young men, and as men; and there are no exceptions, no failures, in the plan of God, but even so God realizes His full and complete design. The human race is a great army of laborers, each one called in his hour and recalled;

each one at his daily labor, with his peculiar talents and strength, and with his sickle; the one with great passions that quickly consume the lamp of his life, another destined for a longer existence, but with a flame that burns slowly and dimly; the one a mild ray of the sun that benefits his race, another like the zigzag darting of the lightning in a dark night, whose strong mind leaves a few great ideas which soon pass away again; the one as *deduction*, the other as *sum* in the account of God, but all in His account. He needs blossoms that have fallen, souls of children easily called away; ripening souls of young men; lives in the most beautiful bloom of hope—for He has ordered all of them in wisdom and proportion. Thus the whole race is a picture, in which the degrees of light and of shade produce the harmony of the whole. Who now is the man, that can review this immense whole? Who is the man that can know the part to which his life belongs?

If the sinner knew what place and what rank he occupies in this great and divine order of our world, he might perhaps direct and control his own activity. But as it is, he may commence what he may never be permitted to complete, for he may be called away sooner than he had expected; he may calculate on events with certainty, but changes that are not under his control, take place in the order by which we are surrounded, which overthrow all his calculations. Every hour and every day teaches us that every one of us is the Lord's; but we will not hear.

We all must serve the Lord—some as his slaves, without knowing His will, without desiring His favor; others as His children, initiated by divine revelation into His will, and anxious to promote it. When his unnatural brethren sold Joseph, they expected to gratify their envy and jealousy; but God made use of their arm for the promotion of *His* designs, and what they conceived to be a misfortune for Joseph was turned into a blessing.

The cruel Jews crucified our Redeemer, treated Him like a common criminal; effaced every trace of respect, of good will, of attachment; stigmatized His name, extinguished His life. But God used their arms, without their

knowing or willing it, to execute His plans. He whom they desired to destroy and whom they supposed to have destroyed already, was to come forth gloriously, and as the Messiah of the world. The Jews desirous of annihilating Christ's power by taking His life, laid the foundation of our divine religion which He had come upon earth to establish; for had Christ not been crucified, there would have been no atonement.

This mysterious manner, in which God uses the arm of the wicked, as well as of believers, to accomplish His plan, is very striking throughout the whole history of Christ. From scorn, His enemies had placed a crown of thorns upon His head, but just these thorns were the best symbol of those pains, which our sinful earth, the mother of thorns, had prepared for its Lord. Thus, against their will, they confess symbolically, by a crown of thorns, that Christ had to endure great griefs and pains, in order to give us life and salvation. Again: They hang Him between two sinners, as if He were the greatest among them. They hoped that they thus would wound the wounded breast of our Saviour still more at a time, when His disciples were dispersed, when Judas had betrayed Him, and Peter had denied Him. But what they would, they do not obtain; for they prepare a balm for the wounds of Christ. Faith, that had disappeared in His own disciples, shows itself in a robber. When no one could believe, that the pierced right arm of our Saviour could be strong enough to lead through the dark valley of death, when all despaired of Him who died the death of a criminal being able to open the gates of heaven, the mouth of a robber bears witness that He died to save sinners. Even the cross which they had designed as a reproach, becomes the throne on which the Lord of the world executes judgment, receiving of the two sinners the one that repented and believed into Paradise.

Truly we do not need any further proofs that every one is the Lord's whilst he lives, though he should not know it nor will it. Unless we turn our eyes to Calvary, unless we desire the living water and drink of it, we must be the

Lord's as His slaves, and not as His friends and fellow laborers in His blessed cause.

II.

The sense, however, in which Paul understood the words: "Whether we live or whether we die, we are the Lord's," is, as I have already intimated, that the believer recognizes no other master in heaven nor on earth than Christ; that he is His by *faith*. Upon faith depends his entire relation to Christ and there is no feeling, no thought, no action really good and devoted to our Lord, unless it proceeds from faith. Without a *living faith* in us, we are, therefore, not the Lord's in the sense of Paul, but in the sense of the sinner.

Faith is a gift of God; the effect of the agency of the Holy Ghost on our hearts, causing in us an entire conversion of all our faculties, of our will and of the heart; turning them from what is merely sensual, from the pleasures of the world, from mere earthly desires, to the eternal truth and to holiness, and to Christ, the source of salvation. Though this faith is a free gift of God's grace and mercy, He has ordered it thus that He will use human instrumentality in conveying this precious good to us; and among many other means, the highest and the principal one is the office of the ministry. The minister is a laborer together with God, a steward of His mysteries, a servant of Christ. His duty is to preach *Christ* alone, and nothing else. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake. From the word of Christ's cross proceeds a power that needs no human assistance, but has conquered the world and is conquering it daily. Christ's life, His sufferings, His death, His resurrection, the necessity of repentance, of regeneration, of faith, must be the minister's constant theme; he must preach the word of the cross which breaketh the rock in pieces, purely and without any addition or any self-made explanations; and as the only conditions on the part of man he must represent repentance and faith, so that Christ may

appear as the only Lord, besides whom there is no other, by whom all things were created that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, and who is before all things and by whom all things consist; who alone can give life, since the Father has given Him to have life in Himself. The whole work of the minister then must be, not to make his hearers dependent on *his* authority, but to lead them to the Lord as the believer's only authority and master. But be ye not called Rabbi, for *one* is your Master, even Christ. He is a faithful minister, whose people can say with the Samaritans: "Now we believe not on account of thy saying, for we have heard Him ourselves and know that this is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world."

But when can we hear Christ? When is it that He speaks even yet to us? I that speak with you, am He. So He speaks to the Christian through the rays of the morning sun; so whispers the evening breeze; so murmurs the brook; so roars the hurricane; so sound the woods; so sparkles every dew drop; so twinkle the stars of night. All that is, is a picture of Him, responds to Him, points out the path to Him, bears witness of Him. He speaks to us especially through the minister, through the Church, through misfortunes, and through innumerable blessings. But no where does He speak to us more clearly, more distinctly, than in His ever blessed word. Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of Me. Faith is the only condition of our connexion with the Lord, and this faith every one of us must develop and confirm by reading the word of God. As soon as we neglect this we become dependent on others, on their views, on their explanations; a third person steps in between us and our only Lord, and becomes the interpreter of Him to us. I cannot see with the eyes of another, for he cannot give me his eyes I cannot think with the mind of another, nor can I understand what he says unless I think myself. Should I now suffer any one to give me that faith, which Christ alone can give me? To

hear Christ and understand Him does not require great acuteness of mind, nor learning, nor a high degree of cultivation. Children can understand as well as the wisest; all that is necessary on our part is to turn our hearts, our thoughts, our will to Him; to hear when He speaks to us, and so recognize His voice amid the tumult of the world, as well as in our secluded closet.

I repeat again, we become independent of every authority on earth only when we have a faith full of life and of spirit; when from our own experience we know Christ to be our Master; when we see in every authority on earth, to which we are subject, a reflex, an image of Christ's authority—in every law and command, Christ's will. Only thus do we become free. Abide in my word, and you shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. But be not deceived by artful speeches, nor believe every spirit, but try the spirits, whether they are of God.

But how can we try them, unless it be by the word of God; and how can we know the word of God unless we ourselves search the Scriptures which lead us directly to Christ? As long as we need a third person to tell us what the Scriptures teach on this or that point, what Christ will have us do in the different relations of life, whether He commands or forbids what we desire; if we believe only on account of the testimony given by others; if our reverence, our obedience, our attachment, our views of Christ's great work and merit have no other basis, but that which those, who teach us, represent to us; if we have not seen for ourselves;—then in cases of doubt, we become dependent on men, like the Catholics on their priests; then our mouth is silent, our judgment ready as soon as they have spoken as they have judged. Such a faith will not suit our wants, our circumstances, our degree of intellectual culture. It is like a coat not made for us, that, when having put it on, can neither protect us from the wind nor from the storm. Like the savage who has an idol, in which he believes and which he places where he can use it; to which he runs, when he is in danger; which he removes again, when he does not need it any longer; which he leaves at

home, when he goes to his business or to his enjoyments —so is a faith, that does not rest on our own conviction, that does not attract irresistibly all our thoughts and wishes; that has not changed all our faculties and our heart; that does not restrain us from avarice and selfishness, and from being dependent on any thing on earth, or on any notions and wishes of our own; that, in short, does not make us free from self-will and render us the servants of Christ only, to whom we must devote our whole life.

Whoever, on the other hand, has a living faith, walks during his whole life in the presence of Christ, the Sun of truth, to whom he is alive, who purifies him by His enlightning power and removes all darkness. He becomes more pure every day; but the more pure he becomes, the more humble, the more meek will he be also. Peace takes up its abode in his breast; for the coat of discontentment—his own will—drops off; he knows of something, which is better than himself, better than all that he could find or desire on earth; this he seeks and every where he is ready to perform the will of Christ, and to do all things for His honor and glory. Faith kindles a spark of life in his heart; growing in faith this spark becomes a light which shines forth in works of love. Faith is a constant intuition of our Lord and His sufferings, takes away our thoughts from mere external things, and is full of desire to see the time come, when the world will be covered with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the deep.

May the Lord lead every one of us to the fountain of faith and truth.

Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name, thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven; give us this day our daily bread; forgive us our sins as we forgive those that sin against us; lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.

The Lord bless you and keep you, the Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace.

Art. V.—THE ATHANASIAN CREED.

We propose in this article to discuss the name, origin, authority, contents, value and use of the so called *Athanasian Symbol*, which, next to the Apostles' Creed and the Nicene, or rather Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, is the most generally received Confession of faith in the Christian Church, and presents to us a succinct and clear summary of ancient Catholic theology concerning the fundamental articles of the holy Trinity and the person of Christ.*

For the convenience of the reader, we give first the symbol itself in three parallel columns, in the original Latin, the old English translation of the sixteenth century, and the revised translation prepared for the new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church in the United States.

We give the old translation precisely as it is found in the Common Prayer Book of the Church of England, and in the old Dutch Reformed Liturgy; but we italicize those

* The necessary information on this subject may be found in *Tillemont*, Memoirs pour servir à l'histoire eccles. (tom. VIII, 667 sqq.), *Montfaucon*, edition of the Works of Athanasius (tom. II, 719 sqq., Diatribe de Symbolo Quicunque); *Bingham*, Antiquities of the Christian Church (vol. IV, 118 sqq.); *J. G. Walch*, Introductio in libros ecclesiae Luth. symbolicos (lib. I, cap. 2 de tribus symbolis oecumenicis, p. 36 sqq.); and *Koellner*, Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen, Theil I. p. 53 sqq. We have consulted more particularly Walch and Köllner, who have made good use of all their predecessors. Besides there are a number of special dissertations on the Anthanasian Creed, to which, however, we have unfortunately no access just now. The best of them are the following: *G. J. Voss* (a Dutch Reformed divine), De tribus symbolis, Amsterd. 1642; *J. H. Heidegger* (German Reformed), De symbolo Athanasiano, Zur. 1680; *Dan. Waterland* (Anglican), A critical History of the Athanasian Creed, representing the opinions of the Ancients and Moderns concerning it: with an account of the Mss, Verss. and Comments and such other particulars as are of moment for the determining of the *Age*, and *Author*, and *Value* of it, and the Time of its *Reception* in the Christian Churches, Cambridge, 1724; *Speroni* (Roman Catholic), De symbolo vulgo S. Anthanasii, Patav. 1751; and *Harvey* (Anglican), History and Theology of the Three Creeds, Lond. 1856, 2 vols. The last (from the learned editor of Irenaeus adv. haereses) is probably the fullest, to judge from its size and some notices I have seen in English Reviews. (Who will have mercy on the Seminary Library at Mercersburg, and furnish it with a sufficient working apparatus for the industry of poor professors?)

words which have been changed in the revised translation for reasons of taste, clearness and closer adherence to the original.

The Latin Original.	*Old Translation.*	*Revised Translation.*
1. Quicunque vult salvus esse, ante omnia opus est, ut teneat catholicam fidem;	1. Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholick Faith;	1. Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic faith;
2. Quam nisi quisque integram inviolatamque servaverit, absque dubio in æternum peribit.	2. Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.	2. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.
3. Fides autem catholica haec est, ut unum Deum in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate veneremur;	3. And the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity and Trinity in Unity;	3. And the Catholic faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;
4. Neque confundentes personas, neque substantiam separantes.	4. Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the substance.	4. Neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the substance.
5. Alia est enim persona patris: alia filii: alia spiritus sancti.	5. For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.	5. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost.
6. Sed patris et filii et spiritus sancti una est divinitas: aequalis gloria, coæterna majestas.	6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one: the Glory equal, the Majesty co-eternal.	6. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one; the glory equal, majesty co-eternal.
7. Qualis pater, talis filius, talis spiritus sanctus.	7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son: and such is the Holy Ghost.	7. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost.
8. Increatus pater: increatus filius: increatus spiritus sanctus.	8. The Father *uncreate*, the Son *uncreate:* and the Holy Ghost *uncreate.*	8 The Father uncreated, the Son uncreated, and the Holy Ghost uncreated.
9. Immensus pater: immensus filius: immensus spiritus sanctus.	9. The Father *incomprehensible*, the Son *incomprehensible:* and the Holy Ghost *incomprehensible.*	9. The Father unlimited, the Son unlimited, and the Holy Ghost unlimited.
10. Aeternus pater: aeternus filius: aeternus spiritus sanctus.	10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.	10. The Father eternal, the Son eternal and the Holy Ghost eternal.
11. Et tamen non tres aeterni; sed unus aeternus.	11. And yet *they are* not three *eternals:* but one eternal.	11. And yet not three eternal, but one eternal.

The Latin Original.	*Old Translation.*	*Revised Translation.*
12. Sicut non tres increati; nec tres immensi; sed unus increatus et unus immensus.	12. As also there are not three *incomprehensibles*, nor three unereated: but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible	12. As also, not three uncreated, nor three unlimited; but one uncreated, and one unlimited.
13. Similiter omnipotens pater: omnipotens filius: omnipotens spiritus sanctus.	13. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty: and the Holy Ghost Almighty.	13. So likewise the Father is almighty, the Son almighty, and the Holy Ghost almighty.
14. Et tamen non tres omnipotentes; sed unus omnipotens.	14. And yet *they are* not three *Almighties:* but one Almighty.	14. And yet not three almighty, but one almighty.
15. Ita deus pater: deus filius: deus spiritus sanctus.	15. So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.	15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God.
16. Et tamen non tres dii; sed unus est Deus.	16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.	16. And yet not three Gods, but one God.
17. Ita dominus pater: dominus filius: dominus spiritus sanctus.	17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord: and the Holy Ghost Lord.	17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord.
18. Et tamen non tres domini: sed unus Dominus.	18. And yet not three Lords. but one Lord.	18. And yet not three Lords, but one Lord.
19. Quia sicut singulatim unamquamque personam Deum ac Dominum confiteri, christiana veritate compellimur:	19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge *every* Person by himself to be God and Lord;	19. For like as we are compelled by the Christian verity, to acknowledge each person, by himself to be God and Lord;
20. Ita tres deos, aut tres dominos dicere, catholica religione prohibemur.	20. So are we forbidden by the Catholick Religion: to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.	20. So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion to say: There be three Gods or three Lords.
21. Pater a nullo est factus, nec creatus; nec genitus.	21. The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.	21. The Father is made of none, neither created, nor begotten.
22. Filius a patre solo est: non factus; nec creatus; sed genitus.	22. The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten.	22. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but begotten.
23. Spiritus sanctus a patre et filio: non factus; nec creatus; nec genitus, sed procedens.	23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.	23. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

Original Latin.	*Old Translation.*	*Revised Translation.*
24. Unus ergo pater. non tres patres: unus filius, non tres filii: unus spiritus sanctus, non tres spiritus sancti.	24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons: one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.	24. So there is one Father, not three Fathers; one Son, not three Sons; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts.
25. Et in hac trinitate nihil prius; aut posterius: nihil majus; aut minus.	25. And in this Trinity *none is afore, or after other: none is* greater, *or* less *than another;*	25. And in this Trinity there is no before, nor after; no greater nor less·
26. Sed totae tres personae coaeternae sibi sunt et coaequales.	26. But the whole three Persons are co-eternal *together*: and co-equal.	26. But the whole three persons are co-eternal, and co-equal.
27. Ita, ut per omnia, sicut jam supra dictum est, et trinitas in unitate: et unitas in trinitate venerenda sit.	27. So that in all things, *as aforesaid:* the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped.	27. So that in all things, as already said: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be worsbipped.
28. Qui vult ergo salvus esse, ita de trinitate sentiat.	28. He therefore that will be saved: must thus think of the Trinity.	28. He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity.
29. Sed necessarium est ad aeternam salutem, ut incarnationem quoque domini nostri Jesu Christi fidelitur credat.	29. Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe *rightly* the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.	29. Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, that we also believe truly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.
30. Est ergo fides recta, ut credamus et confiteamur, quod dominus noster Jesus Christus Dei filius, deus et homo est.	30. For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;	30. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess, that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and man;
31. Deus ex substantia patris, ante secula genitus, et homo ex substantia matris, in ecsulo natus.	31. God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born in the world;	31. God, of the substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds; and man, of the substance of his mother, born in the world;
32. Perfectus deus: perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens.	32. Perfect God and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;	32. Perfect God, and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;
33. Aequalis patri secundum divinitatem: minor patri secundum humanitatem.	33. Equal to the Father, *as touching* his Godhead: and inferior to the Father *as touching* his Manhood.	33. Equal to the Father, according to His Godhead, and inferior to the Father, according to His manhood.

Original Latin.	*Old Translation.*	*Revised Translation.*
34. Qui licet Deus sit et homo; non duo tamen, sed unus est Christus.	34. Who although he be God and Man; yet he is not two, but one Christ;	34. Who although he be God and man, yet he is not two, but one Christ;
35. Unus autem, non conversione divinitatis in carnem; sed assumptione humanitatis in Deum.	35. One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by *taking* of the Manhood into God;	35. One, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumptien of the manhood into God;
36. Unus omnino, non confusione substantiae; sed unitate personae.	36. One altogether; not by confusion of Substance: but by unity of Person.	36. One altogether, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person.
37. Nam sicut anima rationalis et caro unus est homo; ita deus et homo unus est Christus.	37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man: so God and Man is one Christ;	37. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man; so God and man is one Christ.
38. Qui passus est pro nostra salute: descendit ad inferos: tertia die resurrexit a mortuis.	38. Who suffered for our salvation: descended into *hell:* rose again the third day from the dead.	38. Who suffered for our salvation, descended into Hades, rose again the third day from the dead.
39. Ascendit ad coelos: sedet ad dexteram dei patris omnipotentis.	39. He ascended into heaven, he sitteth on the right hand of the *Father God* Almighly:	39. He ascended into heaven, He sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.
40. Inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos.	40. From *whence* he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.	40. From thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
41. Ad cuius adventum omnes homines resurgere habent cum corporibus suis;	41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies,	41. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies;
42. Et reddituri sunt de factis propriis rationem.	42. And shall give account for their own works.	42. And shall give account for their own works.
43. Et qui bona egerunt, ibunt in vitam eternam; qui vero mala, in ignem aeternum.	43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting: and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.	43. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil, into everlasting fire.
44. Haec est fides catholica, quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit.	44. This is the Catholick Faith: which except a man believe *faithfully*, he cannot be saved.	44. This is the Catholic faith, which except a man believe truly and firmly, he cannot be saved.

NAME.

The third ecumenical or universal Creed of the Christian Church bears a double name.

It is sometimes called the *Symbolum Quicunque* or simply the *Quicunque*,* from its beginning in Latin: *Quicunque vult salvus esse, Whosoever will be saved.*

But more generally it goes by the name of the *Athanasian Creed*,† from the supposed authorship of St. Athanasius, or its agreement with his theology. This makes it necessary to say a few words on this distinguished father.

Athanasius was the leading champion of the orthodox doctrine on the divinity of Christ and the holy Trinity in the Nicene age. He was born towards the close of the third century at Alexandria, the capital of Egypt. His youth fell in that remarkable transition period of the Christian Church from oppression and persecution to victory and power in the Roman Empire. He made his first appearance on the stage of history at the first general Council, convened by Constantine the Great at the city of Nice in 325, for the purpose of settling the Arian controversy, i. e., the question whether Christ is strictly divine or not; whether he is the eternal Son of the Father and equal in essence with him (ὁμοούσιος), or whether he be a creature of God, though made before the world, and consequently of a different substance (ἑτεροούσιος). Although at that time merely an archdeacon and secretary of bishop Alexander of Alexandria, Athanasius occupied by his talents and zeal the most prominent place in that Council among the defenders of the strict divinity of the Saviour against the Arians who denied it, and materially helped the triumph of the orthodox view, as embodied and symbolically fixed in what has since been called the Nicene Creed. Soon afterwards he became the successor of Alex-

* First by Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, about A. D. 852, who calls it also "Sermonem Athanasii de fide, cuius initium est: quicunque vult salvus esse."

† It first bears this name in the oldest complete manuscript copy extant, called Cod. Usserius secundus, ascribed to the year 703. It has the title: "Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini."

ander in the first episcopal see of Egypt. From this time on, during the long continued Arian and Semi-Arian conflicts which soon followed the temporary settlement at the Nicene Synod, he stood forth as the acknowledged leader of the Nicene or orthodox party, beloved by his friends, feared by his enemies, admired and respected by all. He devoted his whole life, with unwavering consistency in prosperity and adversity, at home and in exile, to the defence of the true Godhead of Christ. This was the one great idea of his mind, the ruling passion of his heart, the all-absorbing object of his will. For this he suffered five times deposition and exile. For this he was willing at any time to shed his blood. He was a man of one idea, indeed, but an idea which he firmly and justly believed to be absolutely fundamental to the Christian system and the salvation of the world. To the violence and intrigues of the imperial court, to the passions and fanaticism of heretical parties, he uniformly opposed the overwhelming force of a commanding genius and a holy life. Although he died several years before the final settlement of this great controversy by the second oecumenical council, held at Constantinople in 381, the triumph of the orthodox view must, under God, be mainly attributed to him. Athanasius was unquestionably the greatest man of his age, and one of the purest and noblest in the history of the Church. He is justly called *the Great* and *the Father of Orthodoxy*.

Even Gibbon, with all his strong prejudices, has pronounced an eloquent eulogy on him in the XXI chapter of his celebrated work. "We have seldom," says this deistic historian, "an opportunity of observing, either in active or speculative life, what effect may be produced, or what obstacles may be surmounted, by the force of a single mind, when it is inflexibly applied to the pursuit of a single object. The immortal name of Athanasius will never be separated from the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and every faculty of his being. Educated in the family of Alexander, he had vigorously opposed the early progress of the Arian heresy: he exercised the important functions of secretary

under the aged prelate; and the fathers of the Nicene council beheld with surprise and respect the rising virtues of the young deacon. In a time of public danger, the dull claims of age and rank are sometimes superseded; and within five months after his return from Nice, the deacon Athanasius was seated on the archiepiscopal throne of Egypt. He filled that eminent station above forty-six years, and his long administration was spent in a perpetual combat against the powers of Arianism. Five times was Athanasius expelled from his throne; twenty years he passed as an exile or a fugitive; and almost every province of the Roman empire was successively witness to his merits and his sufferings in the cause of the Homoousion, which he considered as the sole pleasure and business, as the duty and as the glory of his life. Amidst the storms of persecution, the archbishop of Alexandria was patient of labor, jealous of fame, careless of safety; and although his mind was tainted by the contagion of fanaticism, Athanasius displayed a superiority of character and abilities, which would have qualified him, far better than the degenerate sons of Constantine, for the government of a great monarchy. . . . The archbishop of Alexandria was capable of distinguishing how far he might boldly command, and where he must dexterously insinuate; how long he might contend with power, and when he must withdraw from persecution; and while he directed the thunders of the Church against heresy, he could assume, in the bosom of his own party, the flexible and indulgent temper of a prudent leader. The election of Athanasius has not escaped the reproach of irregularity and precipitation; but the propriety of his behavior conciliated the affections both of the clergy and of the people. The Alexandrians were impatient to rise in arms for the defence of an eloquent and liberal pastor. In his distress he always derived support, or at least consolation, from the faithful attachment of his parochial clergy; and the hundred bishops of Egypt adhered, with unshaken zeal, to the cause of Athanasius. In the modest equipage which pride and policy would affect, he frequently performed the episcopal visitation of his

provinces, from the mouth of the Nile to the confines of Aethiopia; familiarly conversing with the meanest of the populace, and humbly saluting the saints and hermits of the desert. Nor was it only in ecclesiastical assemblies, among men whose education and manners were similar to his own, that Athanasius displayed the ascendency of his genius. He appeared with easy and respectful firmness in the courts of princes; and in the various turns of his prosperous and adverse fortune he never lost the confidence of his friends, or the esteem of his enemies."

ORIGIN.

But is Athanasius really the author of the creed which has so long been identified with his distinguished name? This question must now be decided in the negative, as much so as the question of the strictly apostolic origin of the first ecumenical creed. And yet in both cases there is a certain propriety in the name, if we leave out of view the form of words and actual composition, and look merely to the contents and their essential agreement with the faith and teaching of the supposed authors.

It is probable that the designation was first given to this document with the view simply to characterize its doctrinal tone, as the expression of the faith of Athanasius,* (hence the oldest titles: "*fides Athanasii*," "*fides Catholica*"), and not to indicate the literal authorship and thus to clothe it at once with the authority of a great and universally revered name. At all events there is no room here for a wilful pious fraud. An innocent mistake explains the matter sufficiently, especially in an uncritical age. The real author of this trinitarian creed being unknown, it was naturally traced, first by way of mere conjecture and supposition, to the great representative of the received doctrine of the holy Trinity, whose very name was identified with orthodoxy as regards this particular article. For the terms

* This was the view of Weber, Lib. symb. p. 17: Ab Athanasio nomen habet, non quod ab illo viro vere scriptum sit, sed quod cum sententia Athanasii maxime conveniat. See Köllner, l. c., p. 55.

Athanasian, homoousian, Nicene, orthodox, are used syonymously in the history of the Arian and Semi-Arian controversies of the Nicene Age. This conjecture was, however, by no means generally received at first. Several manuscript copies of the Creed give either no name at all,* or ascribe it to a different author, Anastasius.† We find doubts yet as late as the twelfth century.‡ But after this time the belief in the Athanasian origin became general and prevailed, without examination, down towards the middle of the seventeenth century,‖ when Gerhard John Vossius, a Dutch Reformed divine, made it the subject of a critical dissertation in 1642, and turned the current. Since that time it is almost universally given up by historians and critics, not only by Protestants, as Vossius, Heidegger, Usser, Jeremy Taylor, Pearson, Cave, Bingham, Waterland, Buddeus, Walch, Schroeckh, Neander, Gieseler, Köllner, but also by Roman Catholics, as Petavius, Quesnel, Pagi, Tillemont, Montfaucon, Muratori, Natalis Alexander, Du Pin, Speroni, and even pope Benedict XIV.

The arguments against the authorship of Athanasius are so strong indeed that it is impossible to resist them. Köllner enumerates nineteen. We will mention only the principal ones.

1.) Athanasius himself never mentions this symbol in any of his works, and had no occasion to compose it, being satisfied with the Nicene creed and bent upon explaining and maintaining it against every opposition. Yea, he says distinctly, in one passage,§ that the Nicene creed was suffi-

* Codd. Uss. 1, Treves, Ambrosian., Colb. 1, Regius, Benet C. 2, Benet C. 3. Cotton 3, Cambridge, St. Jam. 2. Comp. Waterland, p. 24, and Köllner, p. 72.

† So the German MSS. Waterland, however, supposes that this is a mere orthographical mistake for Athanasius.

‡ In 1138 by Otho in the words: Athanasius a *quibusdam* dicitur edidisse; and in 1190 by Beleth in the words: Quod ab Athan. P. A. compositum est: *plerique eum Anastasium fuisse falso arbitrantur.* See Montfaucon Diatr. etc. in Opp. Athan. II, 722.

‖ The last distinguished defendants were the Roman Catholic divines, Baronius (Annal. ad ann. 340 num. 11), Bona and Bellarminus.

§ Ep. ad Antioch. tom. I. p. 772. Comp. Köllner p. 73, and Walch, l. c. p. 149.

cient, and that no other profession of faith should be issued.

2.) It is not found in any of the older manuscripts of the works of Athanasius, and those which have it, either deny it to him or express a doubt as to his authorship.*

3.) It is not mentioned by any cotemporary of Athanasius, nor his biographers and eulogists,† nor by any of the fathers and councils of the fourth and fifth centuries, although during the all absorbing trinitarian and christological controversies, they had frequent occasion to allude to this important document if it existed, and although they frequently appeal to the authority of Athanasius and mention his other writings. Under these circumstances the silence is absolutely conclusive against the very existence of the Athanasian creed, unless we choose to suppose that it was concealed for nearly three hundred years, and then suddenly turned up in the sixth or seventh century, which would imply an almost miraculous preservation.

4.) The symbol under consideration was evidently first written in the Latin language and seems to have been unknown among the Greeks before the eleventh century. There are but few Greek manuscript copies extant,‡ and they differ so much, that they unmistakably point to several and rather unskilled translators. Now it is very improbable that Athanasius, even if he knew Latin sufficient-

* Scultetus, in Medulla Patrum, part, 2. de Athan. c. 40, says: In nullo codice extat quos ego quidem vidi, inter Athanasii opera. In uno legitur; sed auctoris nomine suppresso. Speroni, l. c. (quoted by Köllner p. 72) says more distinctly: At multi codd. Mss. sunt, qui non modo non habent hoc symbolum, quamquam opera omnia comprehendant Athanasii; sed negant omnino his verbis: *Symbolum vulgo Athanasii, Symbolum quod non est Athanasii, Symbolum perperam Athanasio tributum.*

† The only allusion which former writers have been able to find, is a passage of Gregorius Nazianz, in his laudatory oration on Athanasius, where he speaks of him as having confessed (ομολογησας) the Godhead and essence of the three (την τριων θεοτητα και ουσιαν). But it is now universally conceded that this does not refer to a particular creed at all, or if so, to one of the two other confessions still extant, in which he likewise speaks of the Godhead and essence of the three Persons.

‡ Four according to Montfaucon, eight according to Waterland. The former asserts that none of them was written before 1300. "Nullum vidimus *Graecum* huius symboli codicem, qui trecentorum sit annorum; nec antiquum alium a quopiam visum fuisse novimus." Diatribe de Symb. Quicunque in Opp. Athan. II, p. 727.

ly to write so well, should have composed such an important document in a foreign tongue, instead of his own vernacular Greek, which was then the prevailing language of the Church and used even by the early Western fathers, as Clement of Rome, Irenaeus of Gaul, and Hippolytus of Rome. (The report, that Athanasius composed it during his exile at Treves, about 340, and submitted it to pope Julius of Rome, in proof of his orthodoxy against the charge of heresy, or that he wrote it at Rome, and that it remained concealed there for a long time, is utterly worthless, since it is not even mentioned before the twelfth century (1130), and is evidently one of the many falsehoods which were manufactured in the middle age for the supposed benefit of the absolute papacy. No Roman divine of any weight, since Baronius and Bellarmin, has dared to give it credit.)

5.) To these external arguments, though mostly of a negative and indirect character, must be added the internal evidence of the Creed itself, which alone is conclusive. For while it omits the favorite expressions of Athanasius, especially the term *homoousios*, on which the whole Arian controversy turned, it contains the later Latin addition *et filio*, concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost,* which the Greek Church never admitted, and generally goes beyond the Athanasian theology and the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, not only in the Trinity, but still more in the Christology, evidently presupposing the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, which were not concluded till the council of Chalcedon in 451, about eighty years after the death of Athanasius. We fully admit that he had already substantially the same faith, but by no means the same logical consciousness or scientific comprehension of it, as is here implied.† He nowhere in his writings speaks

*V. 23: Spiritus Sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus, sed procedens.

† This is honestly admitted even by his learned Benedictine editor, Montfaucon, l. c. p. 723: Licet enim una eademque semper fuerit ea de re Ecclesiae doctrina, nondum tamen hae formulae in Ecclesia receptae vel in confesso erant. He asserts an entire difference of style between the Symbolum Quicunque and the genuine Athanasian writings.

so clearly and definitely of the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit, and as to the two natures of Christ, he even uses expressions which in a *later* age would have been justly liable to a Monophysite or Eutychian construction,* while the Creed which bears his name, is as clear and distinct on this subject as the council of Chalcedon.

But the more difficult question now arises, who is the real author of this remarkable production? Here is a wide field for critical conjecture. Quite a number of persons have been proposed with more or less plausibility, but without sufficient evidence in any case, viz: Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus in Africa, about 484,† Vincentius Lirinensis, about 434,‡ Venantius Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers, about 560,|| Hilarius Arelatensis, about 429,§ Hilarius Pictaviensis, about 354, Eusebius Vercellensis, 354, pope Anastasius I, 398. Athanasius, bishop of Speier, in Germany, 642,. Others assign the symbol indefinitely to some Gallican divine,¶ or to Spanish origin,° others less indefinitely

---

* Especially in one passage De incarnatione Verbi (Opp. ed Montfauc. II, 1) where he says: "We profess also that there is one Son of God who is God according to the Spirit, and Son of man according to the flesh; not two natures, the one to be worshipped, the other not, but one nature of the God Logos which became incarnate (αλλα μιαν φυσιν του Θεου λογου σεσαρκωμενην) and is to be worshipped together with his flesh in one worship." This, and similar passages of Hilary and even pope Julius I, have given great trouble to such Roman divines who deny all development and change in the doctrine of their Church. Comp. Gieseler, Kirchengeschichte I, 2, §88 p. 133 seq.

†By Paschas. Quesnel, diss. xiv. ad Opera Leonis M. p. 384 sqq., Natalis Alexander, Pagi, Dupin. So also Neander, in his posthumous work on Doctrine History edited by Jacobi, Vol I, p. 323, where he says that this Symbol was made most probably in the fifth century in the North African Church by Vigilius Tapsensis, during the renewal of the Arian controversy under the rule of the Vandals. The principal argument for this view is taken from the similarity of thought and style and the occurrence of the passage: "Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus S.; Dominus Pater, Dominus Filius, Dominus Spiritus S.; Omnipotens Pater, Omnipotens Filius, Omnipotens Spiritus S." Vigilius is supposed by some to be the author of the twelve books De Trinitate which go under the name of Athanasius, and also of the Dialogue between Athanasius, Arius and Probus; but this is rather uncertain.

‡ By Jos. Anthelmi, on the ground especially of some resemblance between the Symbl. Athan. and the Commonitorium of Vincentius.

|| By Muratori.

§ By Waterland.

¶ So Pithoeus, Vossius, Montfaucon, Köllner.

° Gieseler.

to a Latin father;* while still others leave the authorship entirely doubtful.†

This very diversity of opinion shows that we do not know the real author. Even the arguments in favor of the claims of Vigilius Tapsensis, which are the most plausible, prove only the possibility, not even the probability, of his authorship.

The case seems to us almost parallel with that of the Apostles' Creed, and in a less degree also with that of the Nicene Creed, and we are surprised that none of the numerous writers on this subject, as far as we can see, has directed attention to this fact.

The Apostles' Creed, it is now universally admitted, can not be traced to the Apostles,‡ nor to any particular author, age or country, but must be regarded as the production of the ancient Catholic Church. Its living root and substance goes back, indeed, to the Apostolic age, to the baptismal formula (Matth. 28 : 19) and the confession of Peter (Matth. 16 : 16). But its present form is the result of a gradual and imperceptible growth which can be traced through the various and yet essentially identical rules of faith or baptismal creeds of the second and third centuries, as found in the writings of Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and which attained its maturity towards the end of the third, or at all events at the beginning of the fourth century, before the Council of Nice in 325, the Nicene Creed being an expansion and more explicit definition of the Apostles' Creed.‖

---

* Pearson and Fabricius.

† Patavius, Taylor, Cudworth, Tillemont, Buddeus, Walch.

‡ As was done first by the presbyter, Rufinus of Aquileja, about 400, in his Exposition of the Creed. He represents it as the joint production of the twelve Apostles before leaving Jerusalem, each contributing one article, and thus explains the word *συμβολον*, taking it in the sense of *συμβολη*, collatio, while in fact it means sign, distinctive mark, form of confession. This tradition became soon current in the fifth century and obtained to the fifteenth, when Laurentius Valla and subsequently Erasmus undermined it.

‖ On the particulars of the origin, history and character of the Apostles' Creed, we must refer to the following treatises: *Rufinus*, Expositio in Symbolum Apostolicum (in the works of Hieronymus). *Augustinus*, De Fide et Symb. *Heidegger*, De Symb. Apost. *Gisb. Voetius*, De Symb. Apost. *J. Pearson*, Exposition of the Creed. *P. King*, The History of the Apostles' Creed. *Koellner*, Symbolik aller Christl. Confessionen, vol. I, p. 6 sqq. *J. W. Nevin*, The Apostles' Creed, three articles in the Mercersburg Review for 1849.

As to the origin of the Nicene or rather Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Creed, we can speak more definitely. We know the precise time of its composition: it was formed at Nice in 325 and completed at Constantinople in 381, with the exception of the clause *filioque*, which is a later addition of the Latin Church and became a bone of contention between it and the Greek Church. We can go further and say that the formula proposed by Eusebius of Caesarea at Nice, was, in all probability, made the basis of the first draft. But this was shaped into a far more definite, anti-Arian character, especially by the insertion of the famous predicate of the Son: *homoousios*, or *consubstantialis*, *coëqual*, *of one substance* with the Father, which Eusebius wished to avoid in the interest of peace. Half a century afterwards the Constantinopolitan Council made several omissions and an important addition concerning the Holy Ghost, called forth by the intervening doctrinal controversies. Thus even this symbol, though less catholic than the Apostolicum, can by no means be traced to any individual author, but must be regarded as the joint product of the Nicene age or of the first two ecumenical Synods.*

We may illustrate the formation of the Nicene Creed by alluding to the official reports and acts of our ecclesiastical and political assemblies. Important matters are generally first referred to a committee of three, five or more persons, with a responsible chairman. He draws up a report, submits it to the other members of the committee for approval, rejection, or revision, which may result in a radical reconstruction. Then it is brought up before the general body for action, and there it again undergoes, in many cases, a variety of changes before it is finally adopted. At all events, if adopted, it ceases to be the work of an individual, or even a committee and becomes the property of the whole body, clothed with all the weight and authority which it may possess.

* The origin and history of the Nicene Creed is more fully discussed by Vossius, Usser, Bingham, Heidegger, Walther, Baier, Blanchini, Suicer, Walch, Köllner, and others. See the literature in Walch, Introductio in libros symbolicos p. 121 sqq., and in Köllner, Symbolik, etc., I, p. 6 and p. 28.

Now, as the Apostles' Creed is the work of the ante-Nicene age, and the Nicene Creed the work of the Nicene age, so the Athanasian Creed may justly be called the work of the post-Nicene age, or of the Catholic Church from the close of the fourth to the close of the fifth century. Its germ may indeed be traced back to Athanasius, and so far it may still go under his name; single words and passages may be found in the writings attributed to Vigilius Tapsensis, and others. But its final shape and form evidently presupposes the Arian, Semiarian, Nestorian and Eutychian controversies, and the first four general councils, none of which alludes to it, although such allusion, if the work existed already, could not possibly be avoided. Its composition, therefore, must be placed after the year 451, when the Council of Chalcedon settled that very doctrine of the two natures in Christ's person, which is so distinctly expressed in this Creed. On the other hand it cannot be carried down to a much later period, since it contains no allusion yet to the Monothelite controversy concerning the two wills of Christ, which commenced in 633 and was finally settled by the sixth general Council in 680. We assign it, therefore, to the second half of the fifth century, or the beginning of the sixth.* It must have proceeded, moreover, from the Latin Church, for reasons already stated, and more particularly from the school of St. Augustine, who insisted more clearly and emphatically than any of the preceding fathers, on the strict equality and coördination of the Son and *Holy Ghost* with the Father, and represented the creation, redemption and sanctification as the work of the one undivided Divinity. The place of composition can not be decided with any degree of certainty. It may have been written in North Africa, the country of Augustine, or in Spain, but more probably in Gaul, where it first spread and found favor.

* We can not agree with Dr. Gieseler (Kirchengeschichte II. §12, p. 109, note 7, fourth ed.) who thinks that the Athanasianum can not be traced beyond the eighth century, and regards all the earlier allusions to it uncertain. He inclines to the opinion that it originated in Spain, where the conflict between the Athanasian and the Arian party continued longer than in any other country. But the majority of critics assign it to an earlier period and to Gaul.

This view of the case is sustained by the manner in which the Athanasian Creed comes to notice. It appears not in full at once, but gradually as it were. We meet first single words and passages of it in several writers of the fifth and sixth centuries, as Vigilius Tapsensis, of Africa (484),* Avitus Viennensis, of Gaul (500),† Caesarius Arelatensis, of Gaul (520),‡ Venantius Fortunatus, of Gaul (560),‖ and also in acts of Councils, especially the Councils of Toledo in Spain, of the seventh century.§ Then we have it in full in a number of Latin manuscript copies, the precise age of which, however, it is impossible, in most cases, to fix with any degree of certainty. The oldest, which is now lost, is assigned to the year 600,¶ the next to 660,° the third to 700,** the fourth to 703,†† etc. The last men-

---

* In the passage already quoted, p. 244.

† Who uses the terms *nec factus, nec creatus, nec genitus*, of the Holy Ghost.

‡ In a sermon which found its way among those of St. Augustine (Opera, tom. v. p. 399,) but which the Benedictine editors of Augustine, also Oudin, Waterland, and Köllner, (l. c. p. 60) ascribe to Caesarius of Arles (503–543) There occurs the first clear allusion which sounds like a direct quotation from the Anthanasianum, as Gieseler admits, who, however, doubts the authorship of Caesarius. It reads thus, (we italicize the words corresponding to the symbol): "Rogo et admoneo vos, Fratres carissimi, ut *Quicunque vult salvus esse, Fidem* rectam et *Catholicam* discat, *firmiter teneat inviolatamque conservet.—Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus et Spiritus Sanctus:* sed tamen non tres Dii, sed *unus Deus. Qualis Pater, talis Filius, talis et Spiritus Sanctus.* Attamen credat unusquisque fidelis, quod *Filius aequalis est Patri secundum divinitatem, et minor est Patre secundum humanitatem* carnis, quam de nostro assumpsit."

‖ Who is supposed by Muratori, Waterland, and Köllner to be the author of the Expositio fidei catholicae, which assumes already the general reception of the Symbolum Quicunque, and defends the *filioque*. For this reason Gieseler denies said Expositio to Fortunatus, but without being able to assign it to any other source.

§ Conc. Tolet. IV. (anno 633) cap. 1. Conc. Tolet. VI. (a. 638) c. 1.Conc. Tolet. XI. (a. 675) praef., and C. T. XIV. (a. 684) c. 8. The close relation between these councils and several passages of the Athanasianum is undeniable, and the question is merely, whether the councils quote from the Symbol without naming it, as most writers suppose, or whether the Symbol borrowed from the councils, as Gieseler (l. c. p. 110) thinks.

¶ It is called Codex Usser. I. Archbishop Usser or Usher saw it in a Psalterium Latino-Gallicum of the Bibliotheca Cottoniana, and assigned it "tum ex antiquo picturae generae, tum ex literarum forma grandiuscula" to the age of Gregory I (590–604). But it has since disappeared.

° The manuscript of Treves on the borders of Gaul and Germany.

** Ms. Ambros in the Ambrosian library at Milan.

†† Cod. Usser. II. (Cotton. I.) in a copy of the Gallican Psalter of King Aethelstan. Usser says of it, De symb. p. 8: "Psalterium illud anno aerae nostrae Christianae 703, longe ante Aethalstani regnantis tempora, ex regulis. Kalendario in libri initio subjunctis scriptum fuisse deprehendi." Wat-

tioned is the first copy which ascribes the symbol to Athanasius, though in a somewhat equivocal way, by calling it the "*Faith* of Saint Athanasius."

If this view be correct, the Symbolum Quicunque is less individual and more catholic in its very origin, than any other confession of Christendom, with the only exception of the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed. This fact does not weaken, but rather strengthens its authority as a confession of faith. If Athanasius were an inspired apostle, then the case would be very different. But as all the teachers of the Church, since the apostles, are fallible men, their writings carry no more weight and authority with them than their merits justify, and the Church has given them by its own consent. The validity and value of the Athanasian creed can in no case be made to rest on the authority of any individual, however great and good, and the more it is separated from individual authorship, the better for its catholic and churchly character.

RECEPTION AND AUTHORITY.

As soon as the Athanasian Symbol clearly appears in history, we find it in high esteem and quietly assuming its position among the authoritative doctrinal and liturgical standards of the *Latin* Church, first in France about 550, then in Spain 630, in Germany 800, in England 880, in Italy 880, in Rome 930.* The Roman Church in this point did not lead but follow public opinion. The Creed was frequently commented upon,† embodied in copies of the Psalter and Breviary, ordered to be committed to memory by the priests, and introduced into the weekly or even daily worship.‡

---

erland (l. c. p. 51, as quoted by Köllner p. 62) remarks: "The Psalter, wherein this Creed is, is the Gallican Psalter, not the Roman; the title is, *Fides Sancti Athanasii Alexandrini:* the oldest monument of any we have extant (—Cod. Uss, I. being lost—) ascribing this Creed to Athanasius."

* See Waterland l. c. and Köllner p. 85.

† By Venantius Fortunatus, Hincmar, Bruno of Würzburg, Peter Abälard, St. Hildegard, Alexander ab Hales, John Wycliffe, and others.

‡ Hatto, bishop of Basel, A. D., 820: "Ut Fides S. Athanasii a sacerdotibus discatur et ex corde, die Dominico, ad Primam recitetur." A more ex-

In the *Greek* Church the Athanasian Creed, when it first became known, after the tenth century, met with opposition, especially on account of the Latin doctrine of the procession of the Spirit *from the Son*, as well as from the Father.‖ Subsequently it was likewise introduced, but less extensively than in the Latin Church, and with some alterations, and with the omission of the *και εκ του υιου, et filio*, (corresponding to the *filioque* in the Latin versions of the Nicaeno-Constantinopolitan Symbol).§

From the Latin Church the Athanasian Creed, together with the other two ecumenical Creeds, passed over into the orthodox *Protestant* Churches, and was either separately and expressly acknowledged, or substantially incorporated into their doctrinal or devotional standards.

The *Lutheran* Church received it among its symbolical books. Luther appreciated it highly and was disposed to regard it as the most important and glorious production since the days of the Apostles.† The "Augsburg Confession" substantially repeats its doctrine of the Trinity, and of Christ's person, without naming it.‡ The "Form of Concord" distinctly recognizes it as scriptural, true and authoritative.§ Hence it is found in all the editions of the

---

plicit testimony for the liturgical use of this Creed in the French and English Churches is furnished by Abbo of Fleury about 997 (quoted by Köllner, p. 65). Of later usage Bona (Tract. de divina Psalmodia, p. 863) says: "Illud symbolum olim, teste Honorio, quotidie est decantatum, jam vero diebus Dominicis in totius coetus frequentia recitatur, ut sanctae fidei confessio ea die apertius celebretur."

‖ Some Greek divines denied that Athanasius ever wrote it; others maintained that he was drunk when he composed it; still others that the Latins corrupted his Creed by the insertion of the *et filio*. The last is also asserted in the Confessio Metrophanis Critopuli, comp. Kimmel's Monumenta Fidei Ecclesiae Orient., P. II. p. 23.

§ Bingham: Presenter Graeci eo utuntur nonnullis additamentis aucto et aliquantum mutato.

† "Es ist also gefasset," he says, "dass ich nicht weiss, ob seit der Apostel Zeit in der Kirche des Neuen Testaments etwas Wichtigeres und Herrlicheres geschrieben sei." Comp. Luth. Opp. Hal. VI. 2313 sqq.

‡ Art. I and Art III (p. 9 and 10 ed. Hase).

§ Epit. p. 571, and more fully in the Solida Declar. p. 632 (ed. Hase): "Amplectimur etiam tria illa Catholica et generalia summae auctoritatis Symbola, Apostolicum, videlicet, Nicenum, et *Athanasii*. Haec enim agnoscimus esse breves quidem, sed easdem maxime pias, atque in verbo Dei solide fundatas, praeclaras Confessiones fidei, quibus omnes haereses, quae iis temporibus Ecclesias Christi perturbarunt, perspicue et solide refutantur'

"Book of Concord" as the third symbol of the Lutheran Confession.

The *Reformed* Church of *England* gave it a place in the *Common Prayer Book* and ordered it to be sung or said alternately by the minister and people standing, in the morning service on several festival days, viz: Christmas, the Epiphany, St. Matthias, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday, John the Baptist, St. James, St. Bartholomew, St. Matthew, St. Simon and St. Jude, St. Andrew, and on Trinity Sunday. In all these days it takes the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The *Reformed* Churches of the *Continent* have not given the Athanasian Symbol that direct formal sanction and prominence, as the Lutheran and the Anglican.* But they unanimously profess, in their symbolical books, the same doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation; reject the errors of the Arians, Semiarians, Nestorians, Eutychians and Monothelites, and thus acknowledge in fact, if not always in form, the authority of the ancient ecumenical Creeds, in due subjection, of course, to the supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures. The Second Helvetic Confession, drawn up by Bullinger in the name of the Swiss Churches in 1566, and approved by them, endorses, in very strong and unmistakable terms, the doctrine of the first four general councils and of the Athanasian Symbol.† Dr. David Pareus, the pupil and friend of Ursinus, and editor of his Commentary on the Heidelberg Catechism, wrote a special

* Dr. Ebrard, on the contrary, thinks that the Reformed Church makes in some respects even more account of the ecumenical Creeds than the Lutheran (Christl. Dogmatik, Vol. II, p. 89 and 90). This may be true as to the doctrine itself, but not as to the formal recognition of these Creeds. Dr. Ebrard has overlooked the distinct recognition in the passage just quoted, in the preceding note, from the Lutheran Form of Concord, and the somewhat disrespectful manner in which Calvin at least (De vera ecclesiae Reformatione) speaks of the Symb. Nicaenum as a "carmen cantillando magis aptum, quam confessionis formula."

† Cap. XI. (p. 487 in Niemeyer's Collectio Confess. in Eccl. Reform. public.): "Quaecunque de Incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi mysterio definita sunt ex Scripturis sanctis, et comprehensa symbolis ac sententiis quatuor primarum et praestantissimarum Synodorum celebratarum *Niceae, Constantinopoli, Ephesi et Chalcedone, una cum beati Athanasii Symbolo*, et omnibus his similibus symbolis, credimus corde sincero et ore libero ingenue profitemur, condemnantes omnia his contraria. Atque ad hunc modum retinemus inviolatam sive integram fidem Christianam, orthodoxam atque catholicam: scientes, symbolis praedictis nihil contineri, quod non sit conforme verbo Dei, et prorsus faciat ad sinceram fidei explicationem."

exposition of the Athanasian Creed, which, however, we have never seen.*

So far the faith in the doctrines of our Symbol was unshaken in the Church and was shared in common by the Greeks, (if we leave out of view their dissent from the *filioque*), Romans and Protestants. The Socinians alone differed from it and prepared the way for a still greater dissent. During the seventeenth century the origin of the Athanasian Creed was first made the subject of critical investigation by Continental and Anglican divines, and resulted in the almost unanimous rejection of the ancient tradition as to its authorship. This had the effect to weaken its authority as a primitive symbol, without undermining the faith in its contents. But when the skeptical and rationalistic flood of the eighteenth century swept away from a large portion of the Church the orthodox faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God, this Creed was almost forgotten and figured only in Church histories among the many idle fabrications of a superstitious and intolerant age.

The reviving faith of the nineteenth century led to a gradual return to the ancient Confessions, first of the period of the Reformation and then also to those of the primitive Church. And although the Athanasian Creed is still comparatively neglected and even passed by in silence by eminent writers† on the very doctrines it so ably and clearly sets forth, it begins again to attract attention more and more and to be appreciated in its true worth without being unduly overestimated as in times past. Dr. Kling, an Evangelical divine of Würtemberg, claims for it a permanent significance in the Christian Church which will never give

---

* Symbolum Athanasii, notis breviter declaratum. Heidelb. 1618 (as Walch has it, l. c. p. 156), or 1619 (according to Köllner, p. 87. Probably the one gives the date of the preface, the other the date of publication.)

† Dr. Baur, in his learned and eminently scholarly, though unsound, work on the history of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation of God, alludes to this Creed only *en passant* in a foot note, Vol. II, p. 33, and p. 168 But what is more surprising still, is that Dr. Dorner, in his invaluable Christological work, should not even mention it, so far as we can see from a cursory glance over both volumes and the index.

up its dogmatic substance.* Dr. Ebrard, one of the leading representatives of the modern German Reformed school of theology, makes still greater account of it in his "Christian Dogmatics,"† represents it as the completion of the ancient Catholic theology and christology, and asserts that it has been most fully taken up and best understood by the symbols and early divines of the Reformed communion.

As to our own country, I am not aware that the Athanasian Creed has ever been made the subject of serious discussion. The Episcopal Church, at its separate organization after the revolutionary war, has thrown it out of its Liturgy, together with the Nicene Creed, (which, however, was subsequently restored at the instance of the English bishops). But this omission must be traced to the prevalence of the latitudinarian spirit of the eighteenth century, which proposed, in the General Convention held at Philadelphia in 1785, a number of other omissions and changes in the Liturgy, the Thirty Nine Articles and even in the Apostles' Creed.‡ If the Episcopal Church were to be reorganized now, as it was in 1784, the Athanasian Creed, as well as the Nicene, would probably keep its place in the Liturgy, and many of its ministers would gladly see it restored.—The Lutherans of the United States are still bound to this Creed as far as they respect at all the Book of Concord.—The Presbyterians and Congregationalists never, as far as I know, acknowledged it in form, but they teach substantially the same doctrine in their standards.—The Dutch Reformed Church has it as an appendix to its Liturgy, although it is probably never used there in public service.—The new Liturgy of the German Reformed Church, which

* Art. in Herzog's Encyclopaedie, Bd. I, 577.

† Band I. §138 p. 185 sq., u. Vol. II, §377, p. 89 sq.

‡ Comp. on this subject bishop White's Memoirs of the Prot. Episc Ch. in the U. St. of A. Phil., 1820, p. 102 sqq. and 448 sqq., and the "Proposed Book," i. e., the provisional Liturgy of that Church as revised by the Convention of 1785. Many of the alterations, especially also the omission of the Nicene Creed and the article on the descent into hades in the Apostles' Creed, were subsequently given up on the remonstrance of the English bishops, who refused ordination, except on condition of the restoration of that article and of the Nicene Creed.

is as yet, however, merely of a provisional character, has received it, togther with the two older ecumenical Creeds, among the Primitive Forms (p. 17–19), recommends its use on the last communion in the ecclesiastical year (p. 192), and requires the consent to it on the part of the candidates for the ministry in the ordination office (p. 245). This is a step in advance of every other Protestant communion of the country and just the reverse of the negative action of the Episcopal Church in 1785; but, as compared with the original position and doctrinal standards of the Churches of the Reformation, Lutheran, Anglican and Reformed, it is certainly no innovation, but a return rather to old usage under a modified, and we may say simplified and restricted form as to its actual use in public service. Whether the Athanasianum will retain its place at the final revision of this work, remains to be seen. The more closely it is examined, the less objectionable will it appear to those who cherish a strong and hearty belief in the ancient Christian doctrine of the holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God.

CHARACTER AND CONTENTS.

Let us now examine the theology of the Athanasian symbol, the nature of which must determine its value and use in the Christian Church.*

The third ecumenical Creed is an epitome of ancient Catholic theology and sets forth, in clear logical statement, the orthodox faith concerning the fundamental articles of the triune God and the divine-human Saviour, without attempting to explain these unfathomable mysteries. It embodies the permanent results of the trinitarian and christological controversies which agitated, with uncommon violence, the Nicene and post-Nicene age, and were decided successively by the four general Synods held at

* On the theology of the Creed, which we regard as the most important part of the subject, Walch and Köllner are altogether superficial and unsatisfactory.

Nice in 325, at Constantinople in 381, at Ephesus in 431, and at Chalcedon in 451.

For all practical purposes we may say the Apostles' Creed was sufficient, and it is so to this day, as a guide for catechetical instruction of the young and as a confession at baptism and confirmation. In this respect it can never be superseded or improved. Its very simplicity gives it a decided preference for popular catechetical and liturgical use over the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and every subsequent Confession of faith. But theologically and scientifically considered, it is defective, inasmuch as it does not clearly and unmistakably teach the Godhead of Christ and of the Holy Ghost in the full sense in which the Church intended it from the beginning.

Hence it was found necessary to define it more fully at the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, in opposition to the Arian and semi-Arian hypothesis which acknowledged Christ to have existed before the world and to be divine in some sense, but denied his equality with the Father, and which made the Holy Ghost the first creature of the Son, or a mere power and influence of the Godhead. The Nicene Creed calls Jesus Christ not simply the "only begotten Son our Lord," as the Apostles' Creed, but the "only begotten Son of God; begotten of the Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God; begotten, not made; of one substance (*homoousious*) with the Father, by whom all things were made." This is certainly an advance, not in faith, we may say, for this was the same in the beginning, but in knowledge and in expression.

But the theology of the Church could not stop here. The Nicene Creed even in the more explicit form which it received at the Synod of Constantinople in 381, teaches, indeed, the true Godhead of Christ beyond the possibility of mistake, but it gives by no means yet a complete view of the holy Trinity. For in the first place, like the Apostles' Creed, it speaks of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost separately only, without bringing out their oneness of sub-

stance, their mutual relations and distinctive personal properties, so as to exclude every possible form of tritheism on the one hand, and subordinationism on the other. Secondly, it is especially defective in the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which did not come into full view at all during the Arian controversy. In the third place, it is entirely silent on the exact relation which holds between the divine and human nature of Christ, which was brought out only during the succeeding Nestorian and Eutychian controversies.

In all these respects, and especially in the last, the Athanasian Symbol is a decided advance upon its two predecessors. It naturally divides itself into two parts. Each part is introduced by a prologue on the necessity and importance of holding the true faith as afterwards taught, and the whole concludes with an epilogue to the same effect. The first, and larger part, from v. 3–27,* teaches the true doctrine of the Trinity; the second, from v. 26–44, the doctrine of the Incarnation, or the proper constitution of Christ's Person.

1. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, or the Theology, in the strict sense of the term. The Holy Trinity is the sacred symbol and type of the Christian religion, as distinct from the abstract monotheism of Judaism, Mahometanism, and deism on the one hand, and from the dualism and polytheism of the various forms of Paganism on the other. It comprehends all the truths and all the blessings of the revelation or self-communication of God for the salvation of men. Hence it is expressed in the baptismal formula, and confessed in the Apostles' Creed at the very entrance into the Christian Church in the sacrament of baptism (Matth. 28 : 19), and made the all-comprehending and concluding benediction by the Apostle (2 Cor. 13 : 14).

* The division in verses differs somewhat, although the succession is the same in all manuscripts and editions. The Book of Concord makes 42 verses, Weber 43. The best critical edition of the text is said to be that of Waterland. But the Latin codices, of which Montfaucon compared 12, Waterland 24, present a very small number of lectiones variantes, while the Greek copies, though less numerous (8), differ more materially.

It stands thus at the beginning and at the end of Christian worship and controls it throughout. But it is not simply in the two express passages alluded to, that the Bible teaches the Holy Trinity, nor in all the far more numerous passages which prove the Godhead of Christ, or of the Holy Ghost, and which can only be reconciled with the fundamentali dea of the Divine unity on the assumption of a trinity of persons in this unity of substance. We may say the doctrine runs through the entire Scriptures from beginning to end in the form of living facts, or in the exhibition of the revelation of the one only true and living God as Father, Son and Holy Ghost in the work of the creation, redemption and sanctification of the world. We need not be surprised, therefore, that this article stands out so prominently in the faith, worship and theology of the early Church, and gave rise to a long succession of doctrinal controversies. In this article again the divinity of Christ, as the incarnate God and Saviour of the race, formed naturally the central interest and fills the greater portion of the ancient Creeds, since it is the starting point of the Christian consciousness, determines the true idea of God, and was the main object of attack on the part of the ancient heresies, both of Jewish and heathen origin.

The Holy Trinity is a mystery which transcends our present power of comprehension and will furnish food for sacred meditation and praise throughout the countless ages of eternity. Nevertheless, as faith is never irrational and unnatural but merely superrational and supernatural, the subject matter of this article of faith can and ought to be clearly known and stated.

This is done with admirable clearness, precision, brevity and completeness in the Athanasian Creed. It betrays a mind which had evidently mastered the entire subject and fully appropriated it to the intellect as well as to the heart. It not only rejects *Unitarianism* or *Monarchianism*, which either as Patripassianism, or as Ebionism, denies the trinity altogether, but it avoids, also, with singular care and discrimination, the three erroneous forms in which the trinity

may be held and has been held at different times before and since. It excludes, in the first place, *Sabellianism* or *Modalism*, which teaches merely a trinity of revelation, not of essence, and thus falls back at last upon Unitarianism or abstract monotheism; secondly, *Tritheism*, which teaches three divine beings, and thus runs into polytheism; and thirdly, *Subordinationism*, which subordinates the Son to the Father, and the Holy Ghost to both, as partaking in part only, as it were, or to a limited extent, of the Divine essence, or dignity. These errors are not expressly mentioned, but necessarily denied by the positive statement of the opposite view.

The Symbol teaches the Unity in Trinity and the Trinity in Unity, neither dividing the substance, nor confounding the persons.* 1) The *Unity* of the Godhead as to being, substance or essence: "The Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is all one, the glory equal, the majesty coequal. . . There are not three eternal, but one eternal. . . not three uncreated, nor three unlimited; but one uncreated, and one unlimited . . not three almighty, but one almighty . . not three Gods, but one God . . . not three Lords, but one Lord. . . We are forbidden by the Catholic religion to say: There be three Gods, or three Lords." 2) The *Trinity* of persons or hypostases. These terms, it is true, must be taken in a peculiar sense, if applied to God. For in human relations three persons constitute three different beings. Yet there is no other term equally expressive. The trinity is in the first place immanent and essential, a distinction in God himself, independent of, and prior to, his manifestation in the world. It is a living relationship and process in God, the vitality, so to say, of infinite intelligence and infinite love. God was from everlasting Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and will remain for ever Father, Son and Holy Ghost as certainly as he is supreme wisdom and supreme

* V. 3 and 4. In v. 27, there is an unimportant difference of reading as to the order. The textus receptus, as found in the Book of Concord, reads, *trinitas in unitate et unitas in trinitate*, while Waterland reverses the order, *unitas in trinitate et trinitas in unitate*. The latter is the order in the old English version and in the revision.

love. This trinity of essence reflects and manifests itself in the economical trinity or trinity of revelation,* that is the threefold divine work of creation, salvation and sanctification. "There is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. . . The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. . . Each person by himself is God and Lord." 3) The internal *relation* of the three persons or their distinctive properties which, however, do not in the least interfere with the strict unity of substance. The Father is himself not made, nor created, nor begotten, but eternally *begetting* the Son; the Son is not made, nor created, but eternally *begotten* of the substance of the Father; the Holy Ghost is not made nor created, but eternally *proceeding* from the Father and the Son.† It is true, in this last point there is a difference of opinion between the Greek and the Latin Church, the former denying the procession from the Son as a later innovation and corruption. But the equality of the Son and the Father in its full sense necessarily requires the *filioque*. Here the Athanasianum follows the Latin view as brought out especially by St. Augustine,‡ and embodied also in the later clause to the Nicene Creed.

This same doctrine of the Trinity, including the *filioque*, was unanimously professed by the Reformers, reasserted in opposition to the Socinians and incorporated into the doctrinal standards of the evangelical Churches. Hase says that the view of the Athanasian symbol "was received *without change* into the symbolical books of the Lutheran

---

* We employ here a terminology which is much later, but the distinction itself between an essential or immanent trinity, and an economical or transeunt trinity enters unquestionably into the ancient Creeds and is implied already in the doctrine of the *eternal* generation of the Son, or the eternal Sonship of Christ.

† Or to express it in nouns according to a later terminology, to the Father belongs negatively the *innascibilitas* or αγγεννησια, positively the *generatio activa* Filii and *spiratio* (πνοη,) *activa* Spiritus Sancti; to the Son belongs the *filiatio generatio* (γεννησια) *passiva*, and *spiratio activa* Spiritus s.; to the Holy Ghost the *precessio* (εκπορευσις) and *spiratio passiva*.

‡ Comp. Augustin, De Trinit. IV, 20: Nec possumus dicere, quod Spiritus S. *et a Filio* non procedat; neque enim frustra idem Spiritus *et* Patris *et* Filii Spiritus dicitur. Nec video, quid aliud significare voluerit, quum sufflans in faciem discipulorum ait: Accipite Spiritum S. Neque enim flatus ille corporeus substantia Spiritus S. fuit, sed demonstratio per congruam significationem, non tantum a Patre, sed *et a Filio* procedere Spiritum.

Church and defended as the most sacred mystery of orthodox Christendom against every kind of opposition."* The Reformed Church, in some of its standards, is even more full and clear on the subject than the Lutheran.† Let us hear the four Reformed symbols which are most extensively used and enjoy the greatest authority, the second Helvetic Confession, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Thirty Nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession.

The larger Helvetic Confession not only expressly endorses the ancient symbols, including the Athanasianum, as we have observed already, but also, in its exposition of the Trinity, is so clear and explicit as to leave no room for doubt whatever.‡ "We believe and teach that God is one as to essence and nature (unum esse essentia vel natura), self-subsisting and self-sufficient for all things, invisible, incorporeal, immense, eternal, the creator of all things visible as well as invisible, the highest good. . . Nevertheless we believe and teach that this same infinite God one and undivided (unum et indivisum) is inseparably and without confusion distinct in persons (personis inseparabiliter et inconfuse esse distinctum) as Father, Son and Holy Spirit, so that the Father from eternity begat the Son (ab aeterno Filium generaverit), that the Son was begotten by an ineffable generation (filius generatione ineffabili genitus sit), and that the Holy Ghost eternally proceeds from both and is to be adored with both (Spiritus S. vero procedat ab utroque, idque ab aeterno, cum utroque adorandus); so that there are not three Gods, but three persons consubstantial, coëternal and coëqual, distinct as to hypostases, and in order (not dignity) one preceding the other, yet without any inequality (nulla tamen inaequali-

* Hutterus Redivivus, oder Dogmatik der Evang. Luth. Kirche. p, 171 of the 8th ed. Comp. his quotations from the Augsb. Conf., the Apology, and the old Lutheran divines, on the subsequent pages. Also Hase's Evang. Dogmatik, p. 515, 4th ed.: "Die hergebrachte Lehre ging ohne alle Durchbildung in die evang. Kirche über, theils durch Reception des Athanasianum, theils durch Wiederholung seines Grundgedankens, wie seiner praktischen Anwendung."

† Comp. Ebrard l. c. I. p. 186 sqq,

‡ Cap. 3 (not cp. 2, as Ebrard quotes), p. 470 ed. Niemeyer.

itate)." Then the Confession quotes several Scripture passages in support of this doctrine, and condemns not only the Jews and Mahomedans and all who blaspheme "sacrosanctam et adorandam hanc Trinitatem," but also those heretics who deny or pervert it, as the Monarchians, Patripassians, Sabellians, Arians, Macedonians and the like.

The Heidelberg Catechism, necessarily more brief, but sufficient for its purpose, says, in the 25th question: "Since there is but one divine essence, why speakest thou of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost? Because God hath so revealed himself in his word, that these three distinct persons are the only true and eternal God."

The Thirty Nine Articles of the Church of England recognize the Athanasian Creed,* and teach in the very first article, which is retained unchanged in the Episcopal Church of the United States: "There is but one living and true God. . . . And in unity of this Godhead there be three persons, of one substance, power, and eternity; the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost."

The Westminster Confession which is held by the Congregational and Presbyterian bodies of England and the United States, approaches more closely to the phraseology and letter of the Athanasian Creed:† "In the unity of the Godhead there be three persons of one substance, power, and eternity, God the Father, God the Son, and God the

* Art. VIII "of the Three Creeds," in the original articles as they still obtain in England. The Episcopal Church of the United States has not only removed the Athanasian symbol from the liturgical service, but also stricken out its name from said article, in the revision of 1801, retaining, however, the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds, and also Art. I and II unaltered, which teach the same doctrine on the Trinity and the Incarnation.

† Chapt. II. § 3. Comp. the Larger Catech. Quest. VIII–XI.
The Westminster standards are hardly ever noticed by German writers, not even by Ebrard and Schweizer, in their works on Reformed Dogmatics, while they refer to every other symbol, the Scotch Confession among the rest, which was superseded by the far more full and accurate Westminster Confession and Catechisms. It is characteristic that Niemeyer in his Collection of all the Reformed Symbols, originally omitted the Westminster standards entirely, but furnished them afterwards in an Appendix, with the excuse that he was unable before to find a single copy of them any where (quod ne unum quidem confessionis Westmonasteriensis sive Puritanae exemplar usquam reperire potueram.)

Holy Ghost. The Father is of none, neither begotten, nor proceeding; the Son is eternally begotten of the Father; the Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son."

Similar quotations might easily be multiplied, but it is not necessary, since the orthodoxy of the Protestant evangelical Churches on this article has never been seriously questioned, not even by Roman Catholic controversialists.

2. The doctrine of the INCARNATION, or the CHRISTOLOGY.

The doctrine of Christ is substantially contained in the confession of Peter, that Jesus of Nazareth is the Christ, i. e. the promised Messiah, the Son of the living God, or in the declaration of John: The word became flesh, or in the word of Paul: God manifest in the flesh. The Church has ever believed in the mystery of the incarnation or the abiding union of the divine and the human in the person of Christ, as the central truth of our holy religion and the foundation of all our hopes. Christ must be the Son of God and the Son of man in the fullest sense of the term, if he really is what he claims to be, the Mediator between God and man, and the Saviour of the world. To deny either his divinity, or his humanity, to reduce him either to a mere man, however great and good, or to resolve him into a gnostic phantom and spectral idea, is a radical heresy and overthrows the Christian salvation. Hence the uncompromising hostility of the ancient Church against Ebionism on the one hand, and Gnosticism on the other. But the exclusion of these two extreme errors is not sufficient. It may be admitted that Christ is both God and man, and yet the *relation* of the divine and human in him be so conceived as seriously to affect either their difference or their unity. The difference may be made so great, as virtually to result in two persons, or the unity may be so pressed, as to teach but one nature. The former is the Nestorian, the latter the Eutychian or Monophysite error. The one allows merely a mechanical and external relation between the divine and human nature in Christ, and substitutes the idea of an indwelling of the former in the latter or of a

moral fellowship for the idea of an incarnation. The other assumes a total absorption of the human nature into the divine in the act of the incarnation, so that Christ ceases to be man and cannot be our model for imitation. In both cases the truth of the incarnation and its result, the redemption and reconciliation of man with God, are seriously endangered and virtually annihilated. Nestorianism falls back at last upon an Ebionite christology, while Eutychianism ends logically in Gnosticism and Pantheism.

Here now the Athanasian Creed, in the second part, steers with equally sound instinct and discrimination between the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies, as it steered in the doctrine of the Trinity between Tritheism and Unitarianism. It teaches that Christ is perfect God and perfect man, equal to the Father as to his divine nature, equal to man as to his human nature, sin only excepted, and yet one and the same Christ, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person,* not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by assumption of the manhood into God.

It is interesting to compare with it the confession of the Council of Chalcedon in 451, which rejected the Eutychian heresy and gave at the same time an exposition of the orthodox doctrine in these words:

"Following the holy fathers, we all teach unanimously that we confess one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, perfect in Godhead and perfect in manhood, truly God and at the same time truly man, of a reasonable soul and body; of the same substance with the Father as to his Godhead, and of the same substance at the same time with us as to his manhood; in all things like unto us, except sin; eternally begotten of the Father according to his Godhead, but in the last days for our sake and for our salvation (born) of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God (τῆς θεοτόκου), according to his manhood; one and the same Christ (ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν κ.), Son, Lord, Only-begotten, who is known in two natures† without mixture and change,‡ with-

* Unus omnino, non confusione substantiae, sed unitate personae, v. 36. This sounds like a direct denial of the Eutychian theory and seems to point to a period after the fourth general Council in 451. But the same view was substantially advanced before Eutyches, and opposed in similar forms as in this passage. Comp. Waterland and Köllner, p. 89sq.

† ἐν δυο φυσεσι, in duabus naturis, as all Latin copies read, instead of the other reading, ἐκ δυο φυσεων, which might be understood in a Eutychian or Monophysite sense.

‡ ἀσυγχυτως, ἀτρεπτως—against Eutychianism.

out division and separation,‖ so that the difference of the natures is by no means abolished by the union, but rather the peculiarity of each nature is saved, and they are united into one person and one hypostasis,§ not divided or torn into two persons, but one and the same Christ: as the prophets from on high and the Lord Jesus Christ himself have taught us, and the faith of the fathers has handed down to us."

The statement of the Athanasian Creed is more simple and condensed and omits the term "mother of God," which is not to be regretted,* but it is equally, if not more clear and explicit. It also illustrates the relation of the two natures in Christ by the union of soul and body in man. It then enumerates, like the Apostles' Creed, the leading facts in the life of the Saviour to his return in glory, and concludes with the doctrine of the last judgment, where the good shall receive everlasting life and the wicked everlasting damnation.

The christology of the Athanasian Creed has likewise passed over, without any material change, into the symbolical books of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches. Leaving out of view the Lutheran doctrine, we will confine ourselves again to the four leading confessions of the Reformed communion.

The Heidelberg Catechism teaches,† that Christ as a Mediator and Deliverer must be *very man*, and perfectly righteous, because the justice of God requires that the same human nature which has sinned, should likewise make satisfaction for sin, and one who is himself a sinner, cannot satisfy for others; and that he must be at the same time in *one person very God*, that he might by the power of his Godhead sustain, in his human nature, the burden of

‖ αδιαιρετως, αχωριστως—against Nestorianism.

§ εισ εν προσωπον και μιαν υποστασιν.

* It must be admitted that the term, θεοτοκος, so obnoxius to the Nestorians, has a good sense, and follows with logical necessity from the orthodox view of the Incarnation. But it is equally certain that it is one-sided (χριστοτοκος and θεανθρωποτοκος would be more complete), that it was not used by the apostles and ante-Nicene fathers, that it is liable to be grossly misunderstood by the illiterate, that it has been greatly abused and made the basis of an excessive, yea idolatrous worship of the Blessed Virgin in the Greek and Roman Churches. We prefer the Scriptural term, "Mother of our Lord." Luke 1. 43.

† Quest XV–XVIII. Comp. Qu. XXIX–XL.

God's wrath, and might obtain for and restore to us righteousness and life.

The second Helvetic Confession,* after teaching distinctly the eternal generation of the Son and his strict equality with the Father, goes on as follows: "The same eternal Son of the eternal God, we believe and teach, has become the Son of man of the seed of Abraham and David, without the cohabitation of man, as Ebion said, being conceived in the purest manner, by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, according to the evangelical history." Then after rejecting the Gnostic and Appollinarian view of the humanity of Christ, it continues: "We acknowledge in one and the same Christ our Lord two natures, the divine and the human, and these we hold to be so connected that they are not absorbed, or confused, or mixed, but united or conjoined in one person, without destroying the permanent properties of the natures; so that we worship one Lord Christ, not two, who is very God, of one substance with the Father according to his divine nature, and very man, of one substance with us men according to his human nature, sin only excepted. Therefore we abominate the Nestorian dogma which makes two out of one Christ, and dissolves the unity of person; so also we utterly execrate the folly of Eutyches, the Monophysites and Monothelites who expunge the property of the human nature."

The Thirty Nine Articles of the Anglican Communion:† The Son, which is the Word of the Father, begotten from everlasting of the Father, the very and eternal God, and of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed Virgin, of her substance: so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person, never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God, and very man," etc.

The Westminster Confession is equally clear and distinct on this subject.‡ "The Son of God, the second per-

* Cap XI: De Jesu Christo vero Deo et homine, unico mundi Salvatore, p. 483 sq. ed. Niemeyer. † Art. II.

† Chapt. VIII, § 2.

son in the Trinity, being very and eternal God, of one substance and equal with the Father, did, when the fulness of time was come, take upon him man's nature with all the essential properties and common infirmities thereof, yet without sin, being conceived by the Holy Ghost, in the womb of the Virgin Mary, of her substance: so that two whole, perfect, and distinct natures, the Godhead and the manhood, were inseparably joined together in one person, without conversion, composition, or confusion. Which person is very God and very man, yet one Christ, the only Mediator between God and man."

It is perfectly plain, then, that the theology and christology of the Athanasian symbol is to this day the public doctrine of the Evangelical as well as the Roman Catholic Churches. To recognize and acknowledge it in form is perfectly consistent with orthodox Protestantism. To reject it altogether, is at the same time to reject the corresponding articles of all our leading confessions of faith.

The only real difficulty in the way, is the *damnatory* clause in the prologue and epilogue of the Athanasian Creed, which makes the eternal salvation dependent upon the reception of this faith in the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. This is the great objection to this symbol even in the eyes of many who otherwise altogether agree with its contents. No doubt the objection would be serious and valid, if the damnatory clause referred to the *form* as well as to the *substance* of faith, and required us to condemn any particular *persons*, especially all those who held loose and unsatisfactory philosophical views on the Holy Trinity, as was the case even with most of the ante-Nicene fathers, not to speak of such men as Milton, Watts, Schleiermacher, Neander, Bushnell and many other distinguished divines in the later ages of the Christian Church. But this is a false interpretation of the clause. The more it is examined and understood in its proper sense, the less objectionable will it appear.

For in the first place, if faith is at all saving, the rejection of faith must be condemning. The assertion of truth

is necessarily also the negation of error. There is no avoiding the conclusion. "He that believeth," says the highest authority, "and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned."* "He that believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God."†

Secondly, the energy and earnestness of faith in its negative as well as positive expression, must not be confounded with intolerance and uncharitableness. The question is here not of persons at all, but simply of truth and error. We are bound as Christians to love the sinner and heretic, and to labor for his conversion, while we abhor and condemn his sin and error.

Thirdly, the Protestant symbols, both Lutheran and Reformed, do substantially the same thing which is found so objectionable in the Athanasian Creed. The Augsburg Confession, the Articles of Smalkald, the Form of Concord, the Helvetic, Gallic, Belgic, Scotch, and other Confessions, expressly condemn, in the strongest terms, such as *damnamus*, *abominamur*, *detestamur*, *execramur*, the trinitarian and christological heresies of the Gnostics, Docetists, Ebionites, Apollinarians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Servetians, Socinians and others.

Finally, in all these cases salvation and condemnation is not made to depend upon the acceptance or rejection of the logical form of statement or any particular degree of knowledge of these mysteries, but only upon the presence or absence of *faith* in the doctrinal *substance* or the great *truth* contained in the statement. The form of expression is simply the outer hull to guard the kernel of truth against misapprehension and perversion. The strength and nourishment lies in the kernel, not in the hull. So it is the truth alone, as apprehended by faith, which can save, and can save a child and a barbarian as well as the ripest and profoundest scholar. But what is the central truth, the main object of saving Christian faith? It is undoubtedly

* Mark 16 : 16. † John 3 : 18. Comp. s, 24. 6, 40 and 47.

the *one only true and living God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, who made us, who redeemed us, and who sanctifies us,* and the *one Lord Jesus Christ, very God and very man, the only Saviour.* This is the faith taught in the Protestant confessions, as well as in the three ancient Creeds; this faith is necessary for salvation, while its wilful rejection must exclude from it; this faith will remain the same to the end of time, however much its philosophical apprehension and logical expression may change and improve with the progressive march of theological science.*

It is in this sense, and in this only, that the ordination service in the new German Reformed Liturgy requires the assent of the candidate of the ministry to the Athanasian as well as the Apostles' and Nicene Creed. The question first gives the contents of these Creeds by way of comment: "Do you believe in one God the Father; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of the Father; and in one Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and with the Father and the Son one God Almighty? And do you believe in one holy Catholic Church, in which is given one true Baptism for the remission of sins? *And do you* consent unto the *system of faith* set forth in the three Creeds, commonly called the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed and the Athanasian Creed?"† Here the "system of faith" to which the candidate is expected solemnly to declare his adherence, is just the belief in the triune God as stated before. But for the purpose of making it still more clear it might be better perhaps to substitute for the last *And do you,* the words, *Do you thus,* i. e., in the sense previously indicated.

* Dr. Kling in his short article on the Athanasian Creed, in Herzog's Encyclopedia, takes the same view of the offensive clause: "Das Vorurtheil," he says, "wird schwinden in dem Maasse, als man sich darüber verständigen wird, dass es (the Athan. S.) uns nur angeht hinsichtlich seines *wesentlichen dogmatischen Gehaltes,* das heisst, insofern als es die Einheit der Gottheit in der dreifachen persönlichen Unterschiedenheit und umgekehrt, und die vollkommene Gottheit und vollkommene Menschheit des Einen untheilbaren Christus als unvermengt, unverwandelt und ungeschieden feststellt." . . . "Darin liegt seine bleibende Bedeutung, und nie wird sich die christliche Kirche diesen Gehalt und unser Symbolum, insofern es denselben in sich trägt, nehmen lassen, wie auch immer die positive theologische Vermittlung desselben sich ändern und vervollkommnen mag."

† p. 244 sq.

VALUE AND USE.

With this explanation of the damnatory clause we should think that no strong believer in the holy Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God as the fundamental doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, can justly deny the Athanasian Creed a great and permanent value, and object to its reception into the new Liturgy among the Primitive Forms, together with the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. This was not done without due consideration and precedent. Besides the formal recognition of it in several symbolical books of the Reformed Church, it has long had a place in the Anglican, and the Dutch Liturgies. It has also quite recently been embodied in the new hymn book and liturgy of the Reformed Church of Elberfeld, which is perhaps more strictly Reformed than any other congregation in Germany and Switzerland. This work, published in 1853, in addition to the Psalms and two hundred and forty three well selected choice hymns, accompanied with the tunes, contains the Heidelberg Catechism, a number of prayers and short liturgical services, the three ancient Creeds, and also the doctrinal decisions of the Councils of Ephesus A. D. 431, and of Chalcedon A. D. 451.

It is not intended, of course, to place these Creeds on a par with the holy Scriptures in a Romanizing sense, or to weaken in the least the fundamental Protestant principle concerning the rule of faith. The authority of the Word of God is absolute, that of the Confessions of the Church is relative only and conditioned by their agreement with, it; the former is, strictly speaking, the only rule of faith the *norma normans fidei*, the latter are only exponents of the true sense of the Bible and safeguards of sound doctrine, the *norma normata doctrinae.*

Among these Confessions of faith the three Symbols of the ancient Church have always held, and should continue to hold, the highest place, because they are nearest the apostolic fountain; they really contain the fundamental articles of the Christian faith in the shortest and simplest

form; they are ecumenical or universal, being received by all the branches of orthodox Christendom, and they form a link of union between the Church of the present with the Church of the past, up to the age of the confessors, martyrs and immediate disciples of the apostles. The most sacred associations of many centuries cluster around them; they are fraught with the piety, faith, hope, joy and spiritual experience of God's people of all generations and tongues. Why should the Athanasian Creed be banished from its former time-honored position, since it is only the legitimate completion of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, embodies, as we have seen, the purest results of the theology of the first five centuries, and gives the clearest and fullest expression to the Church's faith in the triune God and the divine-human Saviour of the world,—a faith so earnestly and emphatically reconfessed, as with one voice, by all the symbols of evangelical Christendom.

In addition to their doctrinal value the ancient Creeds have also from time immemorial been used for liturgical purposes. Here a proper distinction must be made.

The Apostles' Creed stands decidedly first on account of its simplicity for all practical and popular use. It alone, as already intimated, is properly adapted for catechetical instruction, for baptism and confirmation, and should also be more frequently confessed than any other in the regular service of the Lord's day, as the solemn utterance of the common congregation and a united act of worship, like singing and prayer.

The Nicene Creed, being already more artificially constructed and rising somewhat in its terminology above the ordinary popular comprehension, should be confined to communion or festival seasons, where it may take the place of the Apostles' Creed.

The Athanasian Symbol, finally, being still more theological and scientific in tone and expression, might be said and sung once a year, either as the new German Reformed Liturgy directs, on the last communion season, or what perhaps would be more appropriate, as the canticle for

Trinity Sunday. The frequent use of it in the mediaeval Latin, and the Anglican Protestant Churches, is to be attributed in part to the former scarcity of hymns, now so happily supplied by our rich treasures of sacred poetry, and can, therefore, not be taken as a precedent. The most solemn and impressive form of professing these Creeds in public worship is the chanting by the choir, either alone or in connection with the whole congregation properly trained for responsive liturgical worship.

Mercersburg, Pa., March, 1859. P. S.

Art. V.—THE PALATINATE: A HISTORICO-GEOGRAPHICAL SKETCH.

ITS HISTORY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE EXTINCTION OF ELDER ELECTORAL LINE, IN 1559.

The lands on the Middle Rhine, which afterward formed the Electorate of the Rhenish Palatinate, were in antiquity inhabited by the Vangiones, Nemetes and Tribochi, German tribes, who were conquered by Julius Cæsar and incorporated in the Roman province of Germania Superior. During the decline of the empire the confederated German hordes of the Alemanni crossed the Rhine, but after their defeat by Clovis, in the battle of Zülpich, 496, they were reduced to subjection and the Franks extended their conquests beyond the Neckar.

Thus the mass of the inhabitants in these regions consisted of the relics of old Roman subjects, some stray bands of vanquished Alemanni and the domineering Franks, among whose warriors the lands were divided; to this mixed population may be added Saxon colonists, whom Charlemagne afterward, in 804, settled on the left bank of the Rhine.

This beautiful river, with its vine-clad hills and dense population, became soon the centre of the Frankish empire and the favorite residence of its kings. New cities arose; cathedrals, churches and monasteries were built and richly endowed. Clothaire II (584–628) founded the bishopric of Spire, and Dagobert I (628–638) enlarged that of Worms with possessions on the east of the river. Charlemagne brought architects from Italy to adorn his beloved Ingelheim with marble palaces, and still existing ruins show that Kreuznach, Worms, Lautern, Neuhausen, Spire, Ladenburg, Selz and others, vied with it in splendor. These *Königspfalzen* became the scene of the glittering diets and crowded national assemblies at which the fate of kings and states was decided; there foreign embassies from Constantinople and Mohammedan Spain were pompously received, and twenty-five conquered nations carried their homage and tributes to the throne of the mighty emperor.

The Rhenish provinces depended directly on the crown and were governed by a Count Palatine.* Lewis the Pious gave them to his son Lewis the German, in 833, and after the dismemberment of the Frankish empire by the treaty of Verdun they belonged to Germany, yet without being incorporated with the two powerful duchies of Lorraine and Franconia, that arose on the downfall of the royal dignity in the family of Charlemagne.

Little is known of the first counts on the Rhine. The Lords of Lâche (de Lacu), so called from their castle on the lake in the mountains of Andernach, wealthy and powerful barons in the dioceses of Cologne and Trèves were the earliest counts palatine mentioned in documents

* See my first article *on the Palatinate*, in Mercersburg Review, Jan., 1859. Page 145, et. seq.

The Rhine lands, like the rest of ancient Germany, were divided into districts or valleys—*Gaue*—separated by the natural boundaries of mountains or rivers. On the west of the Rhine lay the *Kraich-Gau* toward the duchy of Alemania (Switzerland), the *Gardach-Gau* belonging to Worms, the *Neckar-Gau* on the river of that name, with the *Elsenz-Gau* and *Lobden-Gau* between the Odenwald and the Rhine. On the west of that river the *Spira Gau*, *Wormazfelda* and the *Nahe-Gau*, and toward the Lower Rhine the *Einrich-Gau* and *Trach-Gau* which formed integral parts of the future Palatinate.

from 970, during the reign of the Emperor Otho I. Herman I, count of the Ruhr-gau in Franconia, held that dignity; it was, however, his successor, Henry de Lâche, who in 1093 took the title of *Pfalzgraf bey Rhein.* Yet the influence of that family had already ceased and their allodial territories become alienated, when the Emperor Conrad III, in 1142, conferred the Rhenish Palatinate on his sister's son, Herman of Stahleck. This wild warrior, while enforcing his claim to the bishopric of Worms, began a feud with the not less obstinate Arnold, archbishop of Mayence. The devastation of the ecclesiastical lands, caused by this private feud, was severely punished by the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, who, on his return from Italy in 1156, held an imperial diet at Worms, and there in the presence of all the princes and dignitaries of the empire, condemned the count palatine and his knights, to an indignant punishment,* for the breach of peace, and granted the Palatinate to his brother Conrad of Hohenstaufen.

Thus, an enterprizing prince of a distinguished family, now united the palatine dignity to the sovereign power over the Rhine provinces, which henceforth from imperial crown-lands are transformed into an independent principality, soon destined to take a prominent rank among the States of the Empire.

A new period begins here in the history of the Palatinate, and Conrad, (1155–1195) the first in the series of its princes, possessed the peculiar qualities to be the founder of a state. From his castle on the Jettenbühel at Heidelberg, he was watching, like the eagle from his eiry, every opportunity for extending his dominion ; and being confident of the support of his imperial brother, he boldly laid his hand on the fiefs, bailiwics, pious legacies and churchlands of the neighborhood, while the poor hamlet at the

* This public punishment for feudal war was enacted against the count palatine and ten of his barons at Worms for the *last time ;* it consisted in their carrying each a dog the distance of four miles. The archbishop was pardoned on account of his ecclesiastical dignity and old age. Henry of Stahleck, died soon after of a broken heart, in the monastery of Eberach near Mayence,

foot of the mountain from a cluster of fishermen's huts, rose in population and wealth to the rank and privileges of the beautiful city of Heidelberg. In those times the sword often became the arbiter of disputes; thus the castle of Stahleck with Bacherach, the ecclesiastic lands on the Moselle and the Neckar were occupied; and bishop and baron, were forced to render homage to the warlike Pfalzgrave, who extended his feudal dominions to the Lower Rhine.

Conrad had early lost his sons, and his surviving daughter, Agnes, was now the only heiress of the Palatinate, at a time when the Ghibelline influence was predominant in Germany, under the powerful sway of Frederick Barbarossa and Henry VI. It is, therefore, only to the romantic spirit of chivalry and lady-love, that we can ascribe the strange turn of fortune: that of the *Ghibelline* Conrad giving the hand of his daughter and the succession in the Palatinate to the *Guelf*, Henry count of Brunswick, the son of Henry the Lion, duke of Saxony, and the most inveterate enemy of the Ghibelline dynasty. But so it happened, and in 1195 Henry III followed his father-in-law by right of his wife, Agnes, and with the approbation of the emperor, became the first hereditary Elector of the Palatinate.

Yet once more the ancient family hatred boiled fiercely up; Henry having supported his younger brother, Otho IV, now duke of Brunswick and emperor elect, against Frederick II, of Hohenstaufen, the latter, who prevailed in that long and bloody contest, hurled the ban of the empire against the count palatine and committed the military execution of the sentence to his partizan Lewis of Wittelsbach, duke of Bavaria, to whom he awarded the palatine dignity and the possession of the principality.

The sword was again drawn and swept over the lovely land; yet Henry the Guelf, made good his stand, and it was only on his demise, in 1227, that a compromise was made, by which his daughter, Agnes, the heiress of his lands, married Otho, prince of Bavaria, and thus a final union of the Rhenish Electorate and the duchy of Bavaria took place in 1231, when the new Count Palatine Otho succeeded his father.

This was the last transfer of the electoral dignity of the Palatinate by imperial nomination during the middle ages. United to Bavaria, it remained thenceforth hereditary in the Wittelsbach dynasty, though subdivisions among ambitious and quarrelsome brothers soon took place. The first of these was at Landshut in 1255, between the sons of Otho; the younger, Henry, obtained Lower Bavaria, while the elder brother, Lewis, with the palatinate dignity, held Upper Bavaria and the Rheinpfalz.* This flourishing country consisted at that time of Stahleck, Stahlberg, Bacherach, Caub, Pfalzgrafenstein, Heimbach and other possessions in the Rhine-Gau; Stromberg and Alzey in the Nahe-Gau; Neustadt, Winzingen, and Wachenheim in the Hardt mountains; the two castles and city of Heidelberg, and Weinheim on the *Bergstrasse*, with many other dispersed lands, such as Epstein, Erbach, Thurn and Landscron, all situated in the most delightful regions of Germany, yet not sufficiently protected during the unruly times that followed on the death of Frederick II. It was, therefore, that the Count Palatine Lewis joined the confederacy of the imperial free cities on the Rhine, Maine and Neckar, by which mutual protection was guaranteed among the allies.

Lewis was called the Severe, on account of the cruelty with which he in an outburst of jealousy had brought his innocent wife, Mary of Brabant, to the block. His second wife, Mathilda of Habsburg, bore him two sons, Rudolph and Lewis. On his death in 1294, he left to the first the electoral dignity and the Palatinate on the Rhine, and to the second, Upper Bavaria, to which, in 1314, was added the Imperial crown, and in 1340, the inheritance of Lower

* Lower or Eastern Bavaria—*Niederbayern*—extended from the Bohemian mountains across the Danube, south to the Tyrolese Alps, and bordered eastward on the Kingdom of Bohemia, the Archduchy of Austria and the Archiepiscopacy of Salzburg. Its capital was Landshut on the river Isar. Upper or Western Bavaria—*Oberbayern*—began on the upper Danube ascending southward to the County of Tyrol in the Alps, and bordering on the north and west on the Burggraviatê of Nürnberg, the Duchy of Würtemberg and the Bishopric of Augsburg. Its capital was Munich—*Muenchen*—on the river Isar.

Bavaria by the extinction of the dúcal line of Henry on the death of his great grand son John of Wittelsbach. Lewis was still a child, but Rudolph, being married to the daughter of the Emperor Adolph of Nassau, and supporting his father-in-law in his war with Albert of Austria, the count Palatine was overthrown in the celebrated battle at Göllheim, near the Donnersberg, in which Adalph fell, and the unhappy provinces of the Palatinate suffered for several years the most awful devastations by the Austrian armies of the revengeful Albert. To increase the misery of the Pfälzers, Albert had called to his assistance King Philip the Fair, of France, and thus the wild hordes of that country likewise invaded the Rhine province and made their memory as hateful in 1301, by rapine, murder and all the horrors of war, as afterwards in the campaigns of Lewis XIV, in the 17th century.

What an awful lesson to mankind, that the innocent nations must pay the penalty for the madness of their kings. Nay, it is a melancholy truth that no German state ever suffered so much from family disputes and divisions as Bavaria and the Palatinate. The Wittelsbach dynasty gave the unchristian example of almost continual civil wars, of children against their parents, of brother against brother, or of collateral lines of the same race fighting against one another, and thus for centuries impeding or retarding the progress and development of countries so happily situated and endowed with all the blessings of bountiful providence. Already Rudolph and Lewis began the hateful contest, and had hardly come to a compromise, when the German Emperor Henry VII, of Luxemburg died during his victorious campaign in Italy, 1311. A double election between hostile parties in Germany became now unavoidable; and when the Habsburg adherents chose the Archduke Frederic the Handsome, of Austria, and the Luxemburgers, the Duke of Bavaria, Lewis IV, the Elector of the Palatinate, full of envy and hatred against his brother, declared for Austria, and thus caused his own destruction. Lewis, the Bavarian, carried off the victory, as is well known, and having been crowned German King in

Aachen, he invaded the Palatinate and expelled his brother Rudolph, who fled to Austria, where he died of a broken heart in 1319. The Rhenish Palatinate had thus by force of arms, again become united to Bavaria, and Lewis the Emperor, disregarding the claims of his nephews, ruled over the land as a sovereign. But his disposition was kind and compassionate; his nephews, Rudolph and Rupert, had accompanied him to Italy and fought with chivalrous bravery in Rome. Thus, the heart of the uncle relented, and in the celebrated treaty of Pavia of 1329, he restored the hereditary dominions to the palatine princes.*

* THE WITTELSBACH DYNASTY.

Lewis II, the Severe, Duke of Upper Bavaria †1294.

- Rudolph I, Elector of the Palatinate †1319.
  - Rupert II. Elector †1398.
    - Rupert III Emperor †1410.
      - Lewis III Elector †1436.
      - John of Neumarkt. Count Palatine of Upper Pal. †1443.
        - Christopher, King of Denmark and Norway †1448.
      - Stephen of Simmern and Zweibrücken. †1459.
        - Frederic of Simmern & Sponheim. †1480, &c.
        - Lewis the Black, of Zweibrucken and Veldenz. †1489.
      - Otho Count. Pal. of Mosbach. †1461.

  The younger Simmern line succeeds to the Electorate in 1559. The Veidenz line becomes extinct 1695.

- Lewis IV Elector, †1449.
  - Philip the Sincere, Elector, †1508.
    - Lewis V, Elector, 1544.
    - Rupert the Pretender of Lower Bavaria. †1504.
      - Otho Henry the Magnanimous, Count Palatine of Neuburg-Sulzbach, Elector, 1556, †1559.
      - Philip the Warlike, †1548.
- Frederic I the Victorious Elector. †1476,
  - Frederic II the Wise (?) Elector, †1556.
- Rupert, Elector of Cologne, †1480.

With Otho Henry, the elder electoral line becomes extinct in 1559.

The emperor kept for himself the duchy of Upper and part of Lower Bavaria, but gave back to the sons of his brother, the Palatinate on the Rhine and the north-eastern portion of Lower Bavaria, the ancient province of the *Nord-Gau*, which thenceforth remained united to the Rheinpfalz, under the name of Palatinate of Bavaria or *Oberpfalz*. Yet a family compact was made by which the two lines of the Wittelsbach House pledged themselves as members of the same family, that they would not alienate any part of their possessions, and that the electorial dignity, with the consent of the other electors, should alternate between the palatine and ducal lines, beginning with the Rheinpfalz; in spite of this agreement, this title nevertheless continued without interruption, attached to the Palatinate.

Of the three sons of Rudolph I, Adolph, Rudolph and Rupert, the first had already resigned and died in 1327, leaving a son Rupert II. Thus the two uncles and the nephew now, according to the treaty of Pavia, took possession of the Palatine Electorate and the Upper Palatinate of Bavaria and of many smaller feudal dependencies dispersed partly on the Upper Rhine and partly in the duchy of Bavaria or neighboring territories. Rudolph II took the electoral dignity and divided the provinces with his brother and nephew. But it was soon to be seen how far the conditions of the treaty of Pavia could be enforced; for by the marriage of his daughter Anna to the ambitious and grasping Emperor Charles IV, King of Bohemia and, successor of his uncle Lewis IV, the Bavarian, (†1347) he had most imprudently given his son-in-law claims to the inheritance of his estates. This was an open infraction of the family compact of 1329, and on his death in 1353, the emperor invading the Upper Palatinate, united it to his neighboring kingdom in spite of all the remonstrances of the Palatine heirs and the German princes. The wily Charles gained the friendship of Rupert I, by unjustly conferring on him the Palatine dignity, in prejudice of his nephew, the son of Adolph, and in the *Golden Bull*, which

was published in 1356, the Pfalzgraf bei Rhein obtained the permanent Vicariate of the Empire, the High-Stewardship (*Erztruchsessen-Amt*), the first rank among the secular electors and the *indivisible* possession of the Palatinate, as an important protection against the hostile pretensions of the collateral dukes of Bavaria!

Rupert I (1353–1390) considerably enlarged his principality by the purchase of the county of Zweibrücken with Hombach and Bergzabern in 1385, and by the acquisition of Sinsheim, Mosbach, Neckargemünd, Bretten, Sickingen and other territories and monasteries, which he held as bailiff of the empire. Yet more than all this, the memory of Rupert I has been immortalized by the foundation of the celebrated University of Heidelberg, which having been afterward enlarged and richly endowed by the Emperor Rupert III, and passed unscathed through the scholastic animosities of the fifteenth century, so nobly sustained the great cause of religious liberty and reformation in the sixteenth century. Rupert I died childless in 1390, and his nephew, Rupert II, son of Adolph, then an old man sixty-five years of age, followed him in the Rheinpfalz.

We have now arrived at a time when the Palatinate is to exert a still greater influence on the affairs of Germany and its prince, to wear the imperial crown. Every one of the different tribes of the German nation had already seen its native dynasty attain that dignity. Saxony, Franconia, Swabia, Austria, Bavaria, and Bohemia, had in turn placed kings on the throne of the Sacred Roman Empire of the German nation. That honor awaited now the small principality on the Rhine; but at a time (1400–1410) when it hardly could be considered as an advantage. Never before had Germany been in a more wretched condition; never so desolated by civil feuds, or oppressed by powerful princes, wrangling cities, arrogant bishops and robber-knights. The sovereignty of Italy had been lost during the wars of Guelfs and Ghibellines; the proud Visconti had made himself duke of Milan and—worst of all, the emperor, the inactive and dissolute Wenceslas, far away from Germany, had become the prisoner of his own nobles in Bohemian.

It was then that the Electors of Mayence and Treves, with some secular princes, by a very remarkable conspiracy, assembled at Rense in 1400, and deposing the Bohemian idler, offered the diadem to the Count Palatine, Rupert III, who in 1398 had followed his father in the Rheinpfalz. Rupert, in return, freely granted rights and privileges, tolls and territories, and promised to restore the tranquility of Germany and to reconquer Italy. But being as cunning as he was active and brave, he began with marching an army into Bohemia, and on the refusal of Wenceslas to abdicate, quickly took possession of the Upper Palatinate, which so unjustly had been dismembered from his hereditary state. Rupert then exerted himself to bring order into the German chaos, and crossed the Alps with 15,000 horse. But the time of German superiority had passed! He was vanquished by the condottieri of Visconti at Brescia, and though he afterwards occupied Padova, he soon found himself abandoned both by Italian mercenaries and German feudatories and obliged to return to Germany, where all was in inextricable confusion among the contending parties of two emperors and three popes.

Though almost abandoned by his allies, Rupert III continued bravely engaged in his royal duties until his death in 1410, when his states became again divided among his four surviving sons. The eldest, Lewis III, obtained the electoral dignity and the Rheinpfalz, and was the ancestor of the elder Palatine line that became extinct in 1559. His second son, John, succeeded in the Upper Palatinate, which again reverted to the electorate in 1448, on the death of his son Christopher, king of the Calmarian Union in the North. Stephen, the third son, formed a new line as Count Palatine of Simmern-Zweibrücken and his descendent, Frederick III of Simmern, by the inheritance of the electorate in 1559, became the ancestor of the younger Palatine dynasty. The fourth son, Otho, Count of Mosbach, obtained the paternal possessions on the Neckar, with Sinsheim, Kaiserwerth on the Rhine, and Wildenstein on the Danube, with other territories and one thousand florins

a year. Thus in spite of treaties and family compacts, the Palatinate had now shared the fate of Bavaria by being divided in different lines, that scattered its strength and exposed it to the continual trouble of family disputes. Yet in the beginning all went off well; Lewis III had been drilled in the school of his able father. With great ability and consummate prudence he kept aloof from the parties during the period of an almost incredible confusion, when three German kings and three Romish popes contended for superiority and throwing his sword in the scale of Sigismond of Hungary, he secured the favor and friendship of the new emperor, and maintained the dignity of the empire as the imperial lieutenant in the celebrated Council of Constance, where, in 1414, the European world had assembled to compose the great schism of the Church and to burn the heretics.

It was our Count Palatine who superintended the awful execution of John Huss. Lewis possessed more the qualities of a brave knight than of a learned clerk. He was blindly devoted to the Romish Church and felt no pity for the noble minded and enthusiastic reformer. Beneath the fire pile in the square of Constance, on the 6th of July, 1415, the Vicar of the empire surrendered the martyr into the hands of the civil magistrates with the harsh words: "Take away this John Huss, who according to the sentence of our gracious Lord, the Roman King, and at our own command, is to be burnt to death as a heretic." Lewis then led the victim to the stake and denying him the right of speech, gave the signal to the executioners to light the funeral pile. Nay, by one of those strange fatalities we meet in human life, his own brother John, the Count Palatine of Neuburg in Oberpfalz, soon after, with equal fanaticism, ordered the eloquent and faithful friend of Huss, Jerome of Prague, on his return to Bohemia, to be captured and sent back to Constance to meet certain death. But the times and their opinions change.

——— Tempora mutantur
Et nos mutamur in illis!

The protestant grand-children of these illiberal princes afterwards viewed as deadly crimes what their ancestors no doubt gloried in as true Catholic virtues! For the childless and suffering Ott' Henry, the last stripling of the electoral line, considered with anguish the extinction of the dynasty as the just decree of Providence, and that it was a merited retribution "that the stem should wither and perish, whose founder had been stained with the innocent blood of the martyrs of truth."* John and Stephen were defeated by the avenging sword of the Hussites, and fled from the horrible battle-field of Traus in 1431, while Lewis, after long sufferings and blindness, died in 1436. Under the influence of the monks, he had become devout, and performed a pilgrimage to Jerusalem. In his latter years he endowed churches and monasteries; but left a more grateful memory in the protection he so nobly extended to the University at Heidelberg. This institution had become richly endowed and divided into several Colleges, with fourteen professors and a numerous attendance of students from every part of Germany. It rose in reputation under its worthy President, Marsilius von Inghen, and its celebrated library already contained a precious collection of manuscripts and all the scholastic and theological works of the age.

Lewis IV was a sickly child of twelve years at the death of his father. Under the guardianship of Count Otho of Mosbach, the Palatinate enjoyed many years of peace and prosperity. Lewis was an excellent young prince; he defended his Rheinish provinces gallantly against the roving hordes of French mercenaries, the Armagnacs, whom the Emperor Frederick III, most imprudently, had called to his assistance against the Swiss in 1444, and brought the rebellious Counts of Lützelstein to obedience in 1447. Few years after his marriage with Margaret of Savoy, the young elector died in his twenty-fifth year, 1449, leaving an infant son, Philip, to the protection of his able brother,

* See the History of the Rheinish Palatinate by Prof. Dr. Lewis Häusser. Heidelberg, 1856. Vol. I, page 279.

Frederick the Victorious, the beloved champion and hero of the Pfälzers. In other countries an infant sovereign and a prolonged regency are considered as a great calamity: in the Pfalz, however, under the powerful sway of the uncle of Philip, that country rose to greater prosperity, extent and influence than before. Frederick, on the death of his brother, was only twenty-four years, an age in which he had not yet had any opportunity of showing his extraordinary talents in war and government. He at once took the reins of the administration in his own hands and his sword sank heavily on the faithless Lützelsteiners and his treacherous cousin, the Count Palatine Lewis of Veldenz. He then called together, for the first time, the States general of the Pfalz in Oppenheim,* 1450, and shortly afterwards the nobility and clergy in Heidelberg, where they, with the consent of the other counts palatine and the countess dowager, in the name of her infant son, committed the electoral dignity to Frederick during the minority of his nephew, and rendered him willing homage as their sovereign and liege lord. In such unruly times it was considered necessary to confer the absolute power to the bravest warrior of Germany. Yet so wretched was the condition of the empire and so fallen the dignity of its chief, that the new elector of the Palatinate did not even demand the sanction of the emperor Frederick III. In consequence of this slight, the inactive and sullen Austrian became exasperated; he refused the imperial approbation and called to arms the numerous enemies and envious neighbors of the "Usurper." Frederick the victorious, however, was a match for them all and showed himself worthy of his name. In the chivalrous battles at Pfeddersheim and Seckenheim, he prostrated his adversaries and after an active and beneficent reign, on his death, 1460, left the electorate enlarged and consolidated to his nephew, Philip I. The glorious reign of Frederick I, is the most brilliant period in the his-

* An old chronicler of the life and deeds of Frederic the Victorious, mentions the deputies in the General Assembly at Oppenheim as "der Pfalz Fürsten, Prelaten, Graven, Herren, Manschaft und Landschaft."

tory of the Palatinate; the frontiers were extended and new territories acquired by treaty and conquest. The counties of Sponheim and Lützenstein; Stromberg, Bockelheim, Pfeddersheim, Arnheim and other possessions on the Middle Rhine, with Boxberg and Schupf, were united with the Pfalz; forty townships or castles, were conquered, and thirty more acquired by inheritance or treaty. Thus the Palatinate at last formed a compact and well encircled state of the most fertile territories in Germany; they were by Frederick divided into eighteen bailiwics under the administration of *vicedomes* or bailiffs, who at that time of insecurity and violence, were chosen among the bravest knights and feudatories, and held the military and civil jurisdiction over their district. This trust secured the attachment of the most powerful families of the palatine nobility, the Helmstätt, Neipperg, Sickingen, Walbrunn and others who gave their ready support to the elector in the hour of danger.

Philip I, the Sincere, was already in his thirty-eighth year, on the death of his uncle, to whom he had left the government with his free consent, and in whose army he had fought with distinction. And yet his character was entirely different from that of his predecessor. Philip had enjoyed an excellent education; he was fond of classical literature, and delighted in the retired life of the closet, and in the conversation with the learned. If his political activity was crowned with less brilliant results than that of his uncle, so, on the other hand, he was superior to him in the signal encouragement he gave to science and literature, and both those worthy princes thus met the spirit of a new era, which toward the middle of the fifteenth century, opened the path for religious and social reform. Philip was the first among the German rulers, who caught the new light of "revival," and with enthusiasm promoted that powerful movement of the mind, which everywhere began to manifest itself in its steady opposition to the mediæval mysticism in church and school. The whole European world was then on the start: the printing-press of Guttenberg already be-

gan to send forth the profound and elegant works of ancient Greece and Rome. Italy had long been the centre of civilization; its refined sovereigns and opulent cities contended for the glory of being the encouraging patrons of art and poetry. What the Medici, Nicolas V, and other learned popes were for Florence and Italy, Philip the Sincere became for the Palatinate and Germany, which yet, when compared to its southern neighbor, lay in cloudy darkness behind the Alps! The excellent prince had, therefore, a hard fought contest with his pedantic professors at Heidelberg. That University, as a younger daughter of the *Alma Mater* of Paris, supported with virulence the Nominalistic party in the great scholastic battle of the age. Already the Elector Frederick I, had placed several professors in the Faculty of philosophy, who as champions of the more liberal doctrines of the opponent Realists had attempted to put a check to the spirit of guilds, ceremonies and narrow minded views—*Buchstaben-glauben*—which still refused to make any concessions to the more enlightened ideas of the time. The controversy was at its height, when men of liberal and profound learning, such as John Dalberg (afterward Bishop of Worms), Rudolph Agricola of Gröningen, and Conrad Celtes of Schweinfurt in Franconia, made their appearance at the court of Philip, and by their public lectures and writings contributed much to the ultimate victory of the Humanists and the reforms of the University. It was then that the literary society of the Rhine—*die Rheinische Gesellschaft*—was formed; nay, the corypheus of the philologians, John Reuchlin of Pforzheim in the Palatinate, on his visit to the elector in 1496, even succeeded in getting the students of the Heidelberg University to represent his satirical comedy, *Progymnasmata scenica*, which in the witty style and pure language of Terentius lashed severely the hypocritic monks and pettifogging lawyers of the day. The disputations about "the Holy Virgin" between the secular preachers and the Franciscan monks in Heidelberg, became so violent in 1501, that the students of the University were prohibited to attend them.

The excitement in the minds was continually increasing—until sixteen years later Luther spoke the word of truth! Social life was yet without refinement; hunting, banquetting and equestrian tournaments were the only distractions of the princes and nobility. Money was so scarce that the great Reuchlin as imperial councellor and "whipping-master" of the young palatine princes, received in yearly pay only a silken gown and one hundred florins; yet a marvellous change was impending.

It seems astonishing that a prince of such prudence and moderation as Philip the Sincere, who during thirty years of peace and prosperity had succeeded in transforming the Rheinpfalz into the most flourishing state of Germany, should now all at once, in his mature age (1503–1507) from a mere desire of agrandizement and vain illusion of obtaining a Bavarian inheritance by force of arms, draw all the evils of war and dismemberment on his happy country.

The duchy of Bavaria was then divided between two lines of the younger Wittelsbach dynasty: Albert of Upper Bavaria or *Bayern-München*, and George of Lower Bavaria or *Bayern Landshut*. The latter being rich, without male heirs, and as usual, in hostile relations to his cousin of Münich, desired to transfer the sovereignty of his duchy to the Palatine line, to whom he had united himself by the closest alliance of friendship and marriage. The wife of Philip was his sister, and his only daughter, Elizabeth, he had married in 1499 to the third son of the elector, the generous and warlike Count Palatine Rupert, whom he placed in possession of part of the country before his death in 1503. Yet the haughty Albert of Bayern-München had nearer claims to the inheritance, and having secured the final decision of the Emperor Maximilian I, and the princes of the empire in his favor, by the cession of the best part of the disputed lands to *treacherous Austria* and by keeping the others warm with promises—the terrible war broke out in 1504. The young and rash Rupert relying on the treasure of his father-in-law and on his Bohemian aux-

iliaries, began the unequal contest and was declared in the ban of the empire. This roused the covetous princes, and never before had the Palatinate been beset by so many enemies at the same time. Philip could not abandon the cause of his son, and hoped in vain for the efficient support of Lewis XII of France. The imperial armies, Albert of Bavaria, and all the heirs and descendants of the old enemies, Baden, Würtemberg, Veldenz, Zweibrücken and Leiningen, whom the victorious Frederick so often had chased fleeing from the battle-field, now united to share the spoils of Pfalz; nay, even several neutrals, such as Brandenburg and the city of Nürnberg joined the league, as Aeschylus says:

———ωστε συγγενον
βροτοισι τον πεσοντα λαχτισαι πλεον!

for "when the oak falls there is wood for all." And to increase the horror still more, it was a civil war between kindred lines and—Wittelsbachers! Only Bohemia, Würzburg and the landgrave of Leuchtenberg remained faithful allies and the splendid Rupert, at the head of his Bohemians, took so signal a revenge on the Austrians, that Landshut opened its gates. Bretten and Caub defended themselves heroically and the barbarous Hessians, after a devastating inroad in the beautiful regions of the Bergstrasse, where they destroyed more than three hundred towns and villages, were at last defeated, but retired laden with spoils and more than a thousand tuns of wine! Nor did Bavaria suffer less—and in the midst of all this misery, the young Rupert fell a victim to the pestilence, and his heroic wife, Elizabeth, soon followed him in the grave, leaving two princes, Ott' Henry and Philip, the unprotected heirs of the ambitious claims of their parents! The old elector who, surrounded by enemies, had bravely defended himself in Heidelberg, was now tired of the war and accepted the decision of the Emperor Maximilian, in the diet of Cologne in 1505, according to which the duchy of Lower Bavaria was awarded to Albert; but the small duchy of Neuburg on the Danube, together with the princely treas-

ures and private property of Duke George, were inherited by the young orphans, under the guardianship of their uncle, Count Palatine Frederick. The duchy of Neuburg was henceforth called the *Younger* Palatinate. The ducal line of Munich had gained the victory, and Bavaria had once more become united, but what sacrifices had this fratricidal war entailed! what immense indemnification of lands and treasure had not been made to the rapacious Austrian, and in what a wretched condition was the country itself, devastated and depopulated from one frontier to the other! Nor did the dangers of the elector end here. His enemies were still encamped in the heart of the Palatinate, and only the most painful concessions could save the state. Würtemberg acquired Weinsberg and Marbach, with Maulbronn and Heidenheim. The treacherous Count Palatine of Veldenz had recovered Landsberg and Moschel and kept them. Nürnberg, the imperial republic under the protection of Maximilian, had, with fire and sword, enriched herself in the neighboring lands of the Upper Palatinate and obtained Aldorf, Hohenstein, the monastery of Engelthal and other districts. Hessia was indemnified on the Rhine with Homburg, Schönberg, Stein; though it did not afterward get into entire possession, while the old emperor, with Austrian tenacity, kept his conquests in Alsace. The elector, thus closely beset, refused the ratification of the peace; he remained during his life time in the ban of the empire, and it was not until 1512 that peace was made with Würtemberg, and 1521 with Hessia. Terrible as this war had been to Philip, the after woes of it were not the less so. This mild and pacific prince had become so indebted and was in such a want of the necessary means for carrying on his administration, that during the following years he was obliged to mortgage or sell many of his most precious possessions to the neighboring bishops and nobles. Thus part of the county of Sponheim was mortgaged to the cousins in Simmern; Weingarten and Neuenburg to Baden; Ladenburg came to Worms, other districts to Spire or Mayence, and Sinsheim to the lords of Gem-

mingen. The old elector, borne down with sorrow and sickness, had even the mortification that the emperor on the diet of Constance transferred to Saxony the Vicariate of the empire. Philip the Sincere, protested in vain, and died in Germersheim on the 28th February, 1508; ten days after, his enemy, Albert IV, of Bavaria followed him in the grave. Philip was the father of a numerous family, nine sons and five daughters. Lewis and Frederick followed him in the electorate. Rupert had died during the war of succession; the others either died early or became ecclesiastic dignitaries—and after fifty years the whole family was extinct.

We are now at the close of the middle ages, and the reign of the Elector Lewis V (1508–1544) falls in the time of the most stirring and important events of our modern era—the reformation of the Church by Martin Luther and the accession of Charles V to the imperial throne of Germany.

The sudden change of sovereign in the Palatinate was a relief to that unhappy country, as the conciliating politics of the new elector soon succeeded in the complete restoration of peace and the reconciliation with the emperor. Lewis was thirty years of age, chivalrous in his bearing, prudent and vigilant; he and his brother Frederick had been educated at the court of France. Yet his position was extremely difficult; some of the best provinces were lost or mortgaged without any prospect of being redeemed; the country had been laid waste by the war; money was wanting, the treasury empty and the dukes of Bavaria full of pride at their late success, were watching the opportunity for depriving their Palatinate cousins of the electoral dignity—nor did the Wittelsbach furies rest until this act of injustice was at last consummated in 1623.

Lewis V, however, made advances to Würtemberg and Bavaria and at his marriage with Sibylla, the daughter of Albert, all rancor seemed forgotten at the glittering nuptials in Heidelberg, 1511. From the emperor Lewis he not only obtained the investiture with the Palatinate according to that ancient formality, but the vicariate of the em-

pire was likewise restored to him in 1518, a few months before the death of Maximilian I (12th Jan. 1519), an event which at once placed Lewis at the head of the imperial administration during the interregnum.

The candidates were Francis I, King of France, and Don Carlos of Spain–Burgundy, the grandson of Maximilian. Both rivals sent their embassadors to Germany and distributed immense sums to secure the votes of the electors and the favor of the princes. It appeared at first that Francis would succeed. Lewis, the Elector Palatine, with other Electors, leaned toward France, and no doubt were handsomely paid. But soon Charles of Spain, with the wealth of the New World at his disposal, carried all before him, and Lewis having received 120,000 hard florins and golden promises for himself and his brother Frederick, threw his influence in the scale of Charles V, who was elected in Mayence, 28th June, 1519. Frederick brought the joyful news to Castile, and was awarded with part of the imperial Governorship of Germany, which Charles V divided between the Count Palatine and his own brother Ferdinand of Austria. The general peace and the friendly relations with the emperor, seemed to secure a quiet reign to Lewis V. But the great religious movement had already begun at Wittenberg in Saxony, and it speedily extended to the Palatinate. Martin Luther, accompanied by Staupitz, came to Heidelberg in 1518 where his brilliant disputation in the church of the Augustines before a numerous assembly of professors, students, monks and people of all classes, excited the highest enthusiasm and contributed powerfully to diffusion of the new doctrines. The elector himself was a man of a quiet meditative mind, open to the truth, though adverse to all violent persecutions, which he proved on the celebrated diet at Worms, 1521, where it was on account of *his* manly and decisive opposition to all violence that Luther did not share the fate of Huss at Constance. But the general call for religious liberty and independence, proclaimed by Luther, soon took a dangerous political tendency, which was heightened by the fermenta-

tion of the minds and the writings of Ulric von Hutten, and other champions of constitutional reforms. It was the feudal nobility itself that began to plot against their sovereign princes, and when the brave knight Francis of Sickingen in the Palatinate, was the first to draw the sword against the Archbishop of Treves in defence of the doctrine of Luther, the elector, though unwilling, felt himself obliged to proclaim the ban of the empire against his faithful ally and feudatory. In alliance with the Landgrave of Hesse and the Archbishop of Mayence he besieged the old Lion, the last RITTER, in his strong castle at Landstuhl, near Lautern, in 1523. The artillery soon battered down towers and bulwarks; the castle surrendered and the gallant Sickingen, wounded and a prisoner, expired in the presence of his admiring enemies.* More dangerous was the revolt of the peasantry on the Danube and Rhine, and it was only after the greatest exertions of the princes, secular and ecclesiastic, of central Germany, that tranquillity could be restored. The Palatinate thus became again the scene of fearful devastation during the year 1524 and 1525. Castles, churches, monasteries were burnt, and villages depopulated, until the peaceful Lewis was forced to lead his feudal army against his own subjects. They suffered a bloody defeat at Pfeddersheim, where the archbishop of Treves, at the head of his knights, rode furiously among the fleeing boors and killed a number with his own hand, while the more humane Lewis strenuously exerted himself to stop the slaughter. Of the prisoners, several were executed as ringleaders, and the citizens of Freinsheim, Neustadt and Weissenberg lost their artillery, their privileges and paid heavy contributions.

Everywhere in the Palatinate, Franconia and Thuringia, the most dreadful punishment was inflicted by the conquerors upon the revolted peasantry and all the disaffected who had taken a share in the revolutionary scenes, and revolting cruelties were perpetrated. Nay,

* Häusser's Geschichte der Rheinischen Pfalz. Heidelberg, 1856. Vol. I, page 520.

almost all the princes took advantage of this opportunity to rivet the chains of the vanquished. Only Elector Lewis the Pacific, was too humane and wise to follow their example: this excellent prince, by alleviating the burdens of his peasants and by administering supplies to their comfort and the education of their children, prevented similar movements for the future. To accomplish this on a larger scale, he called together the assembly of the counts and knights of his states in Heidelberg on the 26th of September, where decisive measures were taken and promises of alleviation were given, though the nobility refused to suppress the tithe; it was likewise proposed that though rebellious preachers were to be punished, no hindrance would be laid to the free preaching of the pure Gospel.

Lewis, occupied with these ameliorations at home and the embellishments of the Castle at Heidelberg, took no farther part in the progress of reformation in Germany. He remained aloof as mediator, without pronouncing either for the Catholic or Protestant party. He permitted the new doctrine to develop itself in his states, though he did not promote its interest, and he remained an adherent of the old Church, without becoming the champion of Romish influence in Germany. Henry VIII of England, wrote a pressing exhortation to him "to extinguish the poisonous pestilence of the reformation," which the elector left unanswered; nor had the earnest letters of Pope Hadrian VI to the University of Heidelberg, to hold fast to the faith of Rome more success than the capuchinade of the British despot to the elector. In the mean time the reformation had already taken a firm footing in different parts of the electorate and principally in the Upper Palatinate and the duchy of Neuburg, under the protection of its zealous promoter the Duke Ott' Henry. It began early to extend in the Kraich-Gau, where the concentrated power of the nobility offered it their open protection. Thus the doctrines of Luther were preached in 1522 in Bretten, the birth place of the celebrated Reformer Melancthon, in Wimpfen, Gemmingen, Fürfeld, Eppingen,

Sonnenfeld and Neckarbischofsheim and the active exertions of a Schnepf, Gallus, Irenicus, Ebermann, Rave and other reformers, met with no hindrance from Lewis the Pacific. Beyond the Rhine, Francis of Sickingen, with the assistance of the eloquent Oecolampadius, Bucer, Aquila and Schwebel had already introduced the reform in the West, and the collateral Palatine lines of Zweibrücken and Veldenz were declared adherents of Luther. Everywhere the mass and other Romish rites were abolished and the new Lutheran doctrine and church service introduced.

The great religious war, however, was impending, but Lewis did not live to see its outbreak. He died childless in 1544 and left the succession in the electorate to his brother Frederic II. This chivalric and adventurous prince, now sixty years of age, had been the friend and courtier of the Emperor Charles V. He was too much a man of the world to be a zealous Catholic, though he had at the celebrated diet of Augsburg in 1530, as imperial commissioner, taken a hostile stand against the Protestants. He had spent his life in travels and embassies, escaping with difficulty from the spies of the Inquisition in Spain, and after many frustrated hopes, had married a Danish princess, the daughter of the exiled King Christian II of Denmark.*

On ascending to the electoral dignity the position of Frederick II had become very difficult. He obtained the investiture of the Pfalz only through the favor of the emperor because the regular succession would have passed to his nephew, Ott' Henry of Neuburg, as the son of his *elder*

*The life and adventures of the Count Palatine Frederic have been written and published by his secretary Hubertus Thomas, and give a lively description of the social and political condition of Europe at that time. It is particularly interesting to follow the German Prince and his suite to Spain, and there behold the desolation, poverty and squalid misery of proud Castile, at home smarting under the double scourge of an absolute king and a bloodthirsty inquisition, while her victorious armies abroad *attempted* to conquer the world! Such was the condition of that unhappy country during its most brilliant era! and when we now compare the itineray of Hubertus in 1526 with that of the honest Nürnberg Doctor Tetzel from 1466—of which I gave a sketch in my *World of the Middle Ages*, Vol. II, p. 730, 8 vo. Edition—must we not feel some doubt at the impartiality and truthfulness of modern Historians who in their pompous works throw a veil over all these horrors and give us a wrong side of the picture.

brother Rupert, who perished during the Bavarian war. This prince, a very zealous Lutheran, was highly beloved by the Pfälzers, who feared that their new Catholic Elector at the threatening war might take part with Pope and Emperor and bring an awful reaction over the country. But Frederick was too prudent to throw himself into the vortex. As an independent prince he at once changed his politics; he felt jealous of the Habsburg power and secretly allied himself with France against Charles V, during the Spanish invasion of Champagne in 1544. Nay, he even went a step farther, and after the advice of Melanchthon recognized himself publicly the complete reform of the Church. Thus on the 3rd of January, 1456, the protestant church service was solemnly held in the Cathedral of the Holy Spirit and the Lord's Supper served in both forms, to the intense delight of the people. The immense step was now taken and the Palatine troops under their purple banner joined the army of the Smalkaldian confederacy in the war against the emperor. Yet the victory of Charles at Mühlberg in 1547, soon decided the ruin of the Protestant princes, and Spanish troops occupying Boxberg, threatened the Palatinate. Frederic was forced to yield and when Charles V in 1548 visited Heidelberg he made the old elector give the promise that he would restore the Romish Church according to the imperial decision of the Augsburg *Interim*. The zealous Duke of Neuburg, Ott' Henry, had, during the feud, been expelled from his country, and lived now as an exile in Heidelberg; but Frederick being himself indifferent about religious opinions, old and weary of the vicissitudes of life, obeyed the injunctions of the haughty Spaniard. From the Heidelberg Castle he sent forth his orders, without caring, however, whether they were executed; nay, the Lutheran feeling remained so powerful that even in Heidelberg the Professor Anton Schnor of Antwerp was permitted to represent a satyric drama in his house, in which Persecuted Religion (Eusebeia) having been expelled by kings and princes, finds a happy home in the cottage of the poor villagers. Such was the curious position of

affairs in 1549. Three years later, in 1552, Maurice of Saxony, with his Lutheran army, pressed forward to Inspruck; the emperor fled across the Alps; France invaded Alsace and the peace of Passau, secured all the fruits of the victorious Reformation.

Old Frederick II stood now on the brink of the grave. By flatterers, but not by historians, he is called the Wise. This by-name sounds like a satire, because though he was a perfect knight and courtier, and a traveller, speaking several languages, and well acquainted with the affairs of the world, he had never developed any solid talents nor obtained any profound learning; while his profusion and extravagance, throughout life, had brought him in endless debts, embarrassments and distress. He was fond of buildingmagnificent castles, hunting lodges and palaces, which he left fall to ruin again. His fêtes, banquets—*Trinkgelagen*—tournaments and other equestrian and military performances were the most splendid in Germany, and brought noble visitors to Heidelberg from all corners of Europe. Yet we dwell with particular pleasure on the able reforms he undertook at the Heidelberg University, which at last during his reign emerging from the scholastic bigotry of the middle ages, now hailed the genial light of a purer faith and reformed system of instruction, with a more thorough and tasteful development of classical studies. An efficient *paedagogium* or teachers' school was established and the increased library soon became the most precious in Germany. The pecuniary means for these useful reforms were found in the secularization of rich monasteries and convents. Frederic called distinguished philologians and mathematicians to the chairs, such as Jacob Curio, Nic. Cisner of Mosbach, Graff and the celebrated Jacob Micyllus; nay, even a remarkable lady, Signora Olympia Fulvia Morata from Ferrara, the admiration of Italy in classic accomplishments, filled a chair at Heidelberg University. In Italy it was nothing strange to see a lady at Bologna or Florence lecture to an audience of thousands of students, during the enthusiasm for classical literature in the fifteenth

century, and Italy has thus preceded the United States of America in the emancipation of the fair sex for five centuries. But in Germany a lady professor of a university—was considered as a non-plus-ultra. Most unhappily the young Signora was of delicate health and through change of climate and other misfortunes, died soon after in Heidelberg in 1555.

The death of Frederic II, 1556, and the succession of his nephew, Ott' Henry the Generous, Duke of Neuburg and Sulzbach, secured the Lutheran party in the Palatinate the prominent position which they occupied, though it was feared that the Bavarian duke and other Catholic princes would protest against the investiture of the Palatinate and the Vicariate of the empire being granted to a Protestant prince. Bavaria might thus have renewed her old claims and become a dangerous adversary. Ott' Henry had been in trouble with William, Duke of Bavaria ; he himself had drawn the sword against Charles V in 1546, had been expelled from his duchy and was, during his exile in Heidelberg, the most enthusiastic partisan of the Reformation. Yet in spite of all this he succeeded. The time was a remarkable one; Charles V, tired of the weight of his diadem and of his checkered life had laid down the sceptre, and his brother Ferdinand of Austria desired peace and votes for the imperial election. Thus no opposition was made by the Catholic princes, and the College of the Electors received another protestant member.

Immediately at his arrival on the Rhine in 1556 Ott' Henry proclaimed the final abrogation of all papistic errors and the complete establishment of the Evangelic faith. The new Church regulations, composed by Michael Diller, Stolo and Marbach, soon appeared in the severest Lutheran form. The entire hierarchy underwent a thorough reorganization ; with the princely power and oriental luxury of Bishops, Abbots and Abbesses, it was now at an end. The ecclesiastical Synod was composed of members of the University of Heidelberg, among whom were the distinguished professors Ch. Ehem, Thomas Erast and Michael

Diller. The different degrees of ministers in the new Church were pastors, deacons and superintendents: at the head of the whole Church establishment stood a general superintendent. The Elector Ott' Henry was a liberal minded man of the kindest disposition. He attempted to convert the phantastical Anabaptists by means of a religious disputation at Pfeddersheim in 1557, and when he did not succeed, he still permitted them to live quietly in the country. The same moderation he showed toward other dissenters, and at Frankfort in 1558 he proposed to the assembled princes and signed himself a creed of faith in so moderate a form that without diverging too far from the severe Lutheran Confession of Augsburg, it might yet be accepted by the rest of the Protestants. Even in his nearer intercourse he avoided all that might cause a clashing. He thus preserved peace, but he had hardly closed his eyes in death when that theological controversy began, the progress of which, during the reign of his successor, caused a total revolution in the ecclesiastic relations of the Palatinate.

With Ott' Henry, who died childless on the 12th of February, 1559, terminated the elder palatine line of Lewis III, son of the Emperor Rupert III. According to the family convention, he was followed by the Count Palatine John II of Simmern, the ancestor of the younger electoral dynasty.

We have thus brought the history of the Rhenish Palatinate to the close of the Middle Ages and the extinction of the elder Wittelsbach Dynasty. In our next, and last article, we shall enter upon the more interesting events of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries until the incorporation of the Electoral States with the Kingdom of Bavaria.

A. L. K.

Franklin and Marshall College.
February 14, 1859.

Art. VII.—CALVIN'S ORDER OF HOLY BAPTISM,

TRANSLATED FROM THE LATIN OF THE GENEVA CATECHISM.

THE Sacrament of Baptism being a subject which is at present discussed with earnestness by the periodical press, in books, and more or less in the pulpit also; and as entire branches of the Protestant Church will no doubt soon be led to review prevailing superficial, not to say rationalistic, theories; it is a matter of serious interest to all thinking minds to know definitely the views of the pious and learned men, by whom divine Providence inaugurated the Protestant form of the development of the Church; and of none of them is it less so than of John Calvin, the principal organ of the Reformed Confessions. On this point the *Institutes* are indeed satisfactory; but as the work combats the errors both of Romanism and rationalism, of scepticism and radicalism, passages may be found which are in apparent conflict with the sound scriptural view of Baptism which Calvin evidently held. To such misconception, however, the Order for the solemn administration of the Sacrament, prepared by him, is less exposed; and we may safely refer to it, as giving free, full and unequivocal expression to his views concerning the efficacy, or objective force, of the ordinance.

The following translation, furnished by one of our contributors, is a faithful rendering of the entire office, including rubrics, as contained in the Geneva Catechism. The original Latin may be found in the *Codex Liturgicus Ecclesiae Universae*, edited by Dr. Herm. Adalb. Daniel, Vol. III. p. 114–120. A good translation into German, though not complete, may also be found in Ebrard's *Reformirtes Kirchenbuch*, p. 162–166.—Ed.

ORDER OF HOLY BAPTISM.

Inasmuch as baptism is a solemn adoption into the Church of Jesus Christ, it should be administered to infants either at the time of catechization on the Lord's day, or on any other day, in the presence of the whole congregation.

After the sermon, the child shall be presented. Then the officiating minister shall say:

Our help is in the name of the Lord, who made heaven and earth. Amen.

Do you bring this child here to be baptized?

Answer. We do.

Minister. Our Lord teaches us in what great misery and corruption we are born, when He says we must be born again. For if our nature must needs be renewed, in order that we may enter the kingdom of God, it is clear that that nature is deeply corrupt and hateful in His eyes. Hence He exhorts us to humble ourselves, and lament and abhor our vileness. And thus He prepares us to desire and obtain from Him that grace by which the perversity and unworthiness of our original nature may be extinguished and thoroughly destroyed. For there is no room for Him in us, until we abandon all confidence in our own virtue, righteousness and wisdom, and acknowledge our total depravity.

But when the Lord has made known to us our misery and corruption, He comforts us in His abundant mercy, promising to raise us up by his Holy Spirit to a new life, which shall be to us an entrance, as it were, into His kingdom. To this regeneration belong two things; first, that we renounce our own selves and no longer live according to our own reason or will or natural desires, but submit rather in heart and soul to the Divine wisdom and righteousness, mortifying the flesh with the affections and the lusts thereof; second, that we follow the light of God and obey His most holy will, as He teaches us in His Word and enlightens us and points out the way for us by His Holy Spirit. But both these are fulfilled and perfected in our Lord Jesus Christ; for whoever has part in His *death*, is dead and buried with Him to sin. Hence it is that we are raised by the power of His *resurrection* to a new life, which is from God, since His Spirit guides and rules us and works in us whatsoever is pleasing in His sight. Yet the main source of our salvation is this, that, on account

of His mercy, He pardons all our sins and does not impute them to us, but so blots out the very remembrance of them, that they shall never appear in judgment against us.

All these benefits become ours, as soon as we are engrafted into the body of the Church by baptism; for in this sacrament the Lord testifies *the remission of our sins.* To this end he ordained water as a sign and symbol, to show most clearly, that, as the stains of the body are washed away by this element, He will in the same manner so purge our souls, that no spot or blemish shall any longer appear. Moreover, He thus bestows upon us, that *renovation,* which, as we have before said, consists in the mortification of the flesh and the spiritual life, which He begets and creates within us. Thus we receive from God a two fold blessing in baptism, provided we do not destroy the virtue of this sacrament by neglect and ingratitude. For in it we have the most certain pledge, that God will be to us a gracious Father, not imputing unto us our trespasses, and also that He will ever abide in us by His Holy Spirit, to enable us to fight against the Devil, sin and the desires of the flesh, until we attain the victory and enjoy the liberty of His kingdom, which is a kingdom of righteousness.

Since, therefore, these two things are accomplished in us by the grace of Jesus Christ, it is evident that the truth and substance of baptism are comprehended and included in Him; for we have no other laver but his blood; no other renovation, but in his death and resurrection. In the same manner as he communicates to us His rich blessings through the word, He freely bestows them also through the sacraments.

But our most merciful and gracious God, not content with adopting us into His family and admitting us into the communion of His Church, shows the riches of His grace in a still more glorious manner, by promising to be the God also of our *children and children's children* unto the thousandth generation. Wherefore, although they are descended from the corrupt race of Adam, He admits them to Himself, by reason of the covenant, which He has made

with their parents, and counts them as *His own* children; for which cause, in the very beginning of the Church, He commanded the seal of circumcision to be imprinted upon infants, by which He then signified and declared all that is now represented in holy baptism. And as he ordered them to be circumcised, so He numbered them among His children, and was no less their Father than the Father of those, by whom they were begotten.

And now since the Lord Jesus came down to earth not to diminish the grace of God the Father, but to extend rather to the ends of the earth that covenant of salvation, which till then was confined to the Jewish people, there can be no doubt but that *our* children also are heirs of His life, and the salvation, which He has promised to us; hence Paul declares, that they are sanctified from the mother's womb and distinguished thus from the children of heathen and unbelievers. Hence also, our Lord Jesus Christ suffered little children to be brought to Him, as we read in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray; and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Since then He assures us, that theirs is the kingdom of heaven, and lays his hands on them and commends them to His Father, it is very clear, that we should not exclude them from His Church. Following therefore His rule and command, we will admit this child into His Church, that it may become a partaker of all those blessings, which He has promised to His faithful ones. But, first of all, let us offer it to the Lord in prayer, with humble and devout supplication:

Lord God, almighty and eternal Father! Because in Thine infinite mercy, Thou hast promised to be our God and the God of our children, deign to confirm this Thy blessing unto this child of Christian parents. And as we offer and consecrate it to Thee, do thou receive it into Thy guardian care, show Thyself its God and Saviour, pardon

and remit its original sin, the guilt of which rests upon the whole race of Adam, and furthermore, sanctify it by Thy Spirit, that when it has reached the age of discretion and understanding, it may acknowledge and worship Thee as its only God and Saviour, give Thee praise and honor through the whole course of life, and always obtain from Thee the forgiveness of its sins. But that it may truly receive these blessings, do Thou admit it into the communion of our Lord Jesus, so as to partake, as a member of His body, of all His benefits. Hearken unto us, Father of mercies, that this baptism, which we here perform at Thy command, may have the effect promised in the teachings of Thy Gospel.

Our Father who art in heaven, Hallowed by Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation. But deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. *Amen.*

As this child is now to be admitted into the Christian Church, you will pledge yourselves, when it comes to years of understanding, to instruct it in the doctrine, which is received and approved by the people of God, as it is briefly and summarily comprehended in that confession of faith, which we all hold:

I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth:

And in Jesus Christ His only begotten Son our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; He descended into hell; the third day He rose from the dead; He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence He shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the remission of sins; the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. *Amen.*

You will pledge yourselves, therefore, to take all care that it be instructed in this doctrine, and in everything contained in the Sacred Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, so that it may hear and receive it as the true word of God, sent down from heaven. Moreover, it shall be exhorted to order its life by that rule and precept, which God has given in His law, whose sum is: first, to love Him with all our soul, heart, and strength, and then, our neighbor as ourselves; and also to put faith in the preaching and admonitions, which God has delivered to us through His prophets and Apostles, to deny itself and all its carnal desires, and with jealous devotion to preach the name of Jesus Christ and edify its neighbors.

A promise being given, the child shall be named; then the minister shall pour water upon it, saying:

N. I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

All this shall be uttered with a clear voice and in a vernacular tongue, so that all who are present at the mystery, may understand what is done, and recalling to mind their own baptism, be confirmed more and more.

We are well aware, that in some places many other ceremonies are used, which have not come down to us from the most ancient times. And as they are the inventions of men, without any foundation in the Word of God, and have given rise to much superstition, they ought to be abolished, so as to hinder no one from coming to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is clear, that all things not commanded by God, are left to our own free will; whatever, therefore, does not tend to the promotion of faith should not be admitted into the Church, or if admitted, should be abolished; and the more so, if it be perverted to an idolatrous use.

There is no doubt, that candles, ointments (which are called *Chrismata*) and other things of the kind, were never prescribed by God, but introduced by men, and, in the gradual progress of superstition, have come to be valued and honored more than the institution of Christ itself. It cannot be denied, that we possess the form and substance of that baptism, which was ordained by Christ, followed by His Apostles and practiced by the ancient Church; and we cannot be blamed for not being willing to surpass God himself in wisdom.

ART. VIII.—ANGLO-LATIN HYMNS.

The Rev. Dr. James W. Alexander, of New York, has kindly placed at our disposal some fine specimens of Anglicized medieval hymns, with the permission to publish them in this Review. We add the original Latin for the convenience of the readers who may not have access to it. The first is a translation of the choicest stanzas of St. Bernard's famous *Jubilus rhythmicus de nomine Jesu*, of the twelfth century. In its full length with all the additions of later authors, as given by Daniel, Thesaurus hymnologicus I. 227–230, it contains 192 lines; but the Roman Breviary has shortened and divided it into three distinct hymns: "Jesu dulcis memoria," "Jesu rex admirabilis," and "Jesu decus angelicum." Another version of this sweet and lovely hymn, but less close than this, may be found in Lyra Catholica, p. 102. (N. York reprint, 1851), commencing thus:

JESUS! the very thought of Thee
With sweetness fills my breast;
But sweeter far Thy face to see
And in Thy presence rest.

The best German reproduction of this hymn is Count Zinzendorf's: "Jesu, deiner zu gedenken." A more recent German version is from the pen of Dr. J.A. Königsfeld in his Lateinische Hymnen and Gesänge, p. 125.

The second specimen is an equally happy rendering of a beautiful and touching passion hymn of St. Bonaventura, of the thirteenth century. It may be interesting to the reader to compare this version with the one from the pen of one of the most faithful contributors to this Review, and published in the volume for 1858, p. 481. P. S.

THE NAME OF JESUS.

I.

Jesu dulcis memoria
Dans vera cordi gaudia,
Sed super mel et omnia
Ejus dulcis praesentia.

II.

Nil canitur suavius,
Nil auditur jucundius.
Nil cogitatur dulcius
Quam Jesus Dei filius.

I.

JESUS, how sweet thy memory is!
Thinking of Thee is truest bliss;
Beyond all honeyed sweets below
Thy presence is it here to know.

II.

Tongue cannot speak a lovelier word,
Nought more melodious can be heard,
Nought sweeter can be thought upon,
Than Jesus Christ, God's only Son.

III.

Jesu spes poenitentibus
Quam pius es petentibus
Quam bonus te quaerentibus,
Sed quid in invenientibus.

IV.

Jesu, dulcedo cordium,
Fons veri, lumen mentium,
Excedens omne gaudium.
Et omne desiderium.

V.

Mane nobiscum domine,
Et nos illustra lumine,
Pulsa noctis caligine
Mundum replens dulcedine.

VI.

Quando cor nostrum visitas,
Tunc lucet ei veritas,
Mundi vilescit vanitas
Et intus fervet caritas.

VII.

Amor Jesus dulcissimus
Et vere suavissimus,
Plus millies gratissimus
Quam dicere sufficimus.

VIII.

Jesum omnes agnoscite
Jesum ardenter quaerite
Amorem ejus poscite
Quaerendo inardescite.

IX.

Tu fons misericordiae,
Tu verae lumen patriae
Pelle nubem tristitiae
Dans nobis lucem gloriae.

BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX, died 1153.

III.

Jesus, thou hope of those who turn,
Gentle to those who pray and mourn,
Ever to those who seek thee, kind—
What must thou be to those who find

IV.

Jesus, thou dost true pleasures bring,
Light of the heart, and living spring;
Higher than highest pleasures roll,
Or warmest wishes of the soul.

V.

Lord in our bosoms ever dwell,
And of our souls the night dispel,
Pour on our inmost mind the ray,
And fill our earth with blissful day.

VI.

If thou dost enter to the heart,
Then shines the truth in every part,
All worldly vanities grow vile,
And charity burns bright the while.

VII.

This love of Jesus is most sweet,
This laud of Jesus is most meet, [dear,
Thousand and thousand times more
Than tongue of man can utter here.

VIII.

Praise Jesus, all with one accord,
Crave Jesus, all, your love and Lord
Seek Jesus, warmly, all below,
And seeking into rapture glow!

IX.

Thou art of heavenly grace the fount,
Thou art the true sun of God's mount
Scatter the saddening cloud of night!
And pour upon us glorious light!

JAMES W. ALEXANDER.

THE CROSS OF JESUS.

I.

Recordare sanctae crucis,
Qui perfectam viam ducis
Delectare jugiter.
Sanctae crucis recordare,
Et in ipsa meditare
Insatiabiliter.

I.

Jesus' holy Cross and dying
O remember! ever eyeing
Endless pleasure's pathway here;
At the Cross thy mindful station
Keep, and still in meditation
All unsated persevere.

II.

Quum quiescas aut laboras,
Quando rides, quando ploras,
Doles sive gaudeas;
Quando vadis, quando venis,
In solatiis, in poenis
Crucem corde teneas.

III.

Crux in omnibus pressuris,
Et in gravibus et duris
Est totum remedium.
Crux in poenis et tormentis
Est dulcedo piae mentis,
Et verum refugium.

IV.

Crux est porta paradisi,
In qua sancti sunt confisi,
Qui vicerunt omnia.
Crux est mundi medicina,
Per quam bonitas divina
Facit mirabilia.

V.

Crux est salus animarum,
Verum lumen et praeclarum,
Et dulcedo cordium.
Crux est vita beatorum,
Et thesaurus perfectorum,
Et decor et gaudium.

VI.

Crux est speculum virtutis,
Gloriosae dux salutis,
Cuncta spes fidelium.
Crux est decus salvandorum,
Et solatium eorum
Atque desiderium.

VII.

Crux est arbor decorata,
Christi sanguine sacrata,
Cunctis plena fructibus,
Quibus animae cruuntur,
Cum supernis nutriuntur
Cibis in coelestibus.

VIII.

Crucifixe! fac me fortem,
Ut libenter tuam mortem
Plangam. donec vixero.
Tecum volo vulnerari,
Te libenter amplexari
In cruce desidero.

II.

When thou toilest, when thou sleepest,
When thou smilest, when thou weepest,
Or in mirth, or woe, hast part:
When thou comest, when thou goest,
Grief or consolation showest,
Hold the Cross within thy heart.

III.

'Tis the Cross, when comforts languish,
In the heaviest hour of anguish,
Makes the broken spirit whole;
When the pains are most tormenting,
Sweetly here the heart relenting
Finds the refuge of the soul.

IV.

Christ's Cross is the gate of heaven,
Trust to all disciples given,
Who have conquered all their foes;
Christ's Cross is the people's healing,
Heavenly goodness o'er it stealing
In a stream of wonders flows.

V.

'Tis the cure of soul-diseases,
Truth that guides, and light that pleases,
Sweetness in the heart's distress:
Life of souls in heavenly pleasure,
And of raptured saints the treasure,
Ornament and blissfulness.

VI.

Jesus' Cross is virtue's mirror,
Guide to safety out of error,
True believers' single rest;
Crown of Pilgrims unto heaven,
Solace to the weary given,
Longed for by the humble breast.

VII.

Jesus' Cross, the tree once scorned,
All with crimson drops adorned,
Laden hangs with rich supplies;
These the souls from death are leading,
Who, with heavenly spirits feeding,
Taste the manna of the skies.

VIII.

Crucified! Thy strength supplying,
Let me, till my day of dying,
Gaze upon Thy dying face!
Yea, thy deepest wounds desiring,
Thee, though on the Cross expiring,
Ever pant I to embrace.

JOHN BONAVENTURA, died 1274. JAMES W. ALEXANDER.

Art. IX.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

A New History of the Conquest of Mexico, by *Robert A. Wilson*, Counsellor at Law, etc. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Boston: Crosby, Nichols & Co. Pittsburg: W. S. Rentoul. 8 vo. pp. 539.

Historical criticism has made some wonderful changes necessary in this department of the literature of the past ages. Since the Reformation it has had free scope, at least in Protestant countries, and has also invaded the records of those lands, where ecclesiastical censorship to the ninth degree, as in the case of the Spanish Inquisition, made history to suit the times. History and Romance were formerly so mingled indiscriminately, that fact and fiction were often undistinguishable. Some have asserted that the one is as true as the other. It has even passed into a saw, which declares that History has nothing true in it but real names, while all but the names is true in fable and Romance. A corrupt censorship in the service and under the control of marvellous loving monks, could make anything a history, and history of anything, invented by their caprice, or credulous superstition for the real or supposed benefit of their Church. So at least our author asserts; the histories of the Conquest of Mexico were first made, and all subsequent ones, even down to Prescott, are drawn from the same incorrect sources.

Years ago we read with youthful enthusiasm and admiration Prescott's great History of the Conquest by Cortez. The peculiar fascinations thrown around the wonderful narrative, invest it with all the charms of Romance. We rejoiced that history could be made as attractive as fiction. It was not without some feeling of regret, therefore, that we heard of Wilson's New History of the Conquest of Mexico, which shows that after all we have had only a historical romance founded on fact, rather than the fact of history itself. Prescott's great genius, it is true, made the most of it as he found its materials. But starting with the mythical records of Spanish Traditions, as a basis, he could give us little more than the fabulous creations of Spanish monks, who only were authorized to write the first history under the license of the Inquisition.

It did, however, seem to savor of skepticism and irreverence for the old authorities and traditions of history, for Judge Wilson to set these aside as unworthy of confidence, and then

construct a new plan of a real History of the Conquest of Mexico. It breaks up all our previous conceptions and gives us a *New History*. It was doubtless a bold venture to attempt a radical revolution in this particular department of History. And yet, with the concurrent opinions of Albert Gallatin, and Secretary Cass, men who are fitted to judge by a thorough study of the question, added to our author's own acute observation during his travels and sojourn in that country itself, he fearlessly sets aside "whatever was manifestly untrue" in what has formerly been written.

The Aztecs were Indians, not Jews. Montezuma was only an Indian chief, far removed from the royal dignity and luxury of a Moorish Emperor. The vestiges of ancient civilization he traces to Egyptian and Phœnician origin. Picture writing, of which so much account has been made, he denounces as a monkish imposition, to give authority to their absurd traditions. The miraculous "interpositions of the blessed Virgin and the Saints" are given by those Spanish historians to glorify their Church. In fact the chief staple in their history of the Aztecs were "the devil, the children of Israel, and the Jews."

Our author is of the opinion, that St. Thomas, the Apostle, never visited America; that the woman and child, whose image is inscribed on some of the ruins, is not the Virgin and the Infant Jesus, but the infant sacrifice of Ashtoreth; that the Palenque Cross, is that of the Phœnician coins.

Our prejudices, if we have had any, fall away, or melt before the rays of truth, as we read on, while our author interests us more and more with actual facts, instead of fancy colored fiction. What he writes, thus necessarily becomes emphatically a New History of the Conquest of Mexico.

R.

PALESTINE, PAST AND PRESENT, by Rev. *S, H. Osborn*, A. M. Philadelphia: James Challen & Son. Boston: Philips, Sampson & Co. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. Pittsburg: W. S. Rentoul, 8 vo. pp. 600.

Helps to the better understanding of the Bible, are always welcomed by the lovers of Christian truth. In our day, works on the Holy Land have greatly multiplied in number and increased in interest. Formerly these were beyond the reach of the ordinary student, and without them much of the written word of God was a sealed book. It is now a great pleasure, as well as profit, to enjoy the benefits of others' labor in the travels and researches in Palestine. Thus we are introduced to the

history, manners, customs, products, and main characteristics of the Bible Lands. New light is often brought to bear on dark points.

Prof. Osborn now takes a place among the many illustrious writers, who have traveled in the holy land. His book is a valuable contribution to the literature auxiliary to Biblical studies. In the department of the Natural Sciences, especially, to which the author has devoted himself, we find in his new work, many interesting hints and observations. The Geology of the country, its soil, rocks, hills and plains receive much attention. The Natural History, too, of the land, its animals, birds, insects and reptiles; and the vegetable products, plants, trees, fruits and grains, he so treats of in a scientific way as to add new and clearer meaning to the Scriptures in which reference is made to them.

In many places in the book the Professor is perhaps disposed to parade his scientific acumen pedantically in notes and strained observations. It would almost seem that he went for the express purpose of making a book. He provided himself in the outset with instruments to take bearings and measurements and sketches; also with guide books for references: so that his book is not the result of accident or circumstance, but rather of a matured plan.

Palestine, Past and Present, is withal a beautiful book, magnificently illustrated, and contains also a new map of the country. It has not suffered in the hands of the publishers, Messrs. Challen & Son. In their usual style of superior excellence, they have brought out the book in a garb which would dress with artistic respectability a much less deserving work. They publish in uniform style with this, the new History of the Conquest of Mexico, and The City of the Great King.

R.

Infant Salvation in its relation to Infant Depravity, Infant Regeneration and Infant Baptism. By *J. H. A. Bomberger*, D. D., Pastor of the Race Street Evangelical Reformed church, Philadelphia. Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859. 12 mo. pp. 192.

The duty and significance of Infant Baptism is engaging the earnest consideration of the different branches of the Protestant Church. The sacrament itself has indeed been a part of the professed faith of the Church in every period of her past history, and no less so since the Protestant Reformation of the sixteenth century than it was before; but whilst the Baptists deny the right to it of the great majority of the human race, the

larger number of Pedobaptists, especially in America, though not excluding from it the most helpless and needy, have divested it of all saving spiritual efficacy—of all efficacious operation as a means of grace. Thus one party exclude the great mass of mankind from the use of the ordinance appointed of God for the putting on of Christ, (Gal. 3 : 27) in order to extend salvation the more rapidly and generally; and the other, reducing it to a hollow, outward form, administer the inefficacious *form* to both young and old, as being most conducive to the promotion of spiritual Christianity.

The attractive little volume by Doctor Bomberger on Infant Salvation and Infant Baptism, is but one of many indications of growing dissatisfaction with prevailing narrow and superficial views. Christian consciousness demands something more than a form or mere ceremony; and parental affection, deepened and sanctified by the grace of Christ, can not be reconciled to the exclusion of helpless little children from the blessings of the Gospel. This earnest practical discussion will, therefore, call forth a warm response in many Christian hearts.

The author discusses the following topics: 1. Infant Depravity, 2. The Necessity of Infant Regeneration, 3. Infant Salvation, and 4. Infant Baptism. About one half of the volume is devoted to the third topic—Infant *Salvation.* The argument is thus summed up: "Wherefore taking all these things together,—remembering how much richer are the provisions of the Better Covenant than those of the former dispensation,—keeping in view the Saviour's treatment of little children, and His declaration concerning them,—adding to this the import of the promise announced by Peter on the day of Pentecost,—the argument of Paul in Rom. 5 : 18, 19, and in 1 Cor. 15 : 22,—and the plainly revealed purpose of the day of judgment, and, in a word, considering the general tenor of the entire Gospel of Jesus Christ—tell me, "if Christianity does not throw a pleasant radiance around an infant tomb." p. 147.

On the relation of Infant Baptism to Infant Salvation, we quote the following: "By nature children are depraved and under condemnation. The only way of their deliverance from this sad natural state is through regeneration. This is provided for them, and guarantied to them through the atonement of Jesus Christ, which extends to their salvation from the curse of Adam's sin. Therefore they should receive the appointed sign and seal of that salvation, *they should 'be baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'*

"This must be allowed to follow as an unavoidable conclusion from the entire preceding argument. If children are depraved and need the renewal of their nature to qualify them for heaven; if children are susceptible of such renewing grace by the operation of the Holy Ghost making them new creatures

in Christ Jesus; if the blessed Saviour Himself receives them as His; by what consideration can we refuse them the Sacrament of the formal confession of their spiritual need, and of the formal confirmation of these blessings, here on earth? If we think we have sufficient ground to believe that in case of their early death they would be admitted to fellowship with the saints in the Church above, which is without blemish, with what show of reason or religion can we justify any present exclusion of them, from formal fellowship in the Church below, whose beauty is marred with so many spots? The Bridegroom does not disown them. Will a vain and haughty bride affect such sanctity as to let them lie, on account of their natural uncleanness, unrecognized and spurned at her door? Pharaoh's daughter showed a kinder heart than this.

"But why, if children dying in infancy will certainly be saved, whether baptized or not, why have them baptized at all? This question I know will be asked. And it can be answered, too, most satisfactorily answered for all who are willing to give the replies a candid consideration." pp. 131–153.

Circumcision, the sign and seal of the Abrahamic covenant, was the appointed means by which the children of the Jews were received into the covenant, and enjoyed all its temporal and spiritual blessings. By the same solemn rite proselytes with their children were admitted to the privileges of Jews. But all who were not circumcised were excluded from the blessings of the covenant. As the sacrament of holy Baptism in the new dispensation corresponds to circumcision in the old, it occupies a similar relative position. It is the ordinance of Christ by which persons, whether adults or infants, are introduced into the covenant of grace, and become members of the Christian Church.

We should, therefore, be disposed to argue, not from the fact of infant salvation as a direct result of the atonement to the duty of infant Baptism, but from the fact of infants having been received into the covenant of grace by Baptism to the certainty of infant salvation. Indeed we have never felt any argument in favor of the salvation of infants to be so forcible as the one derived from the fact, that by divine command they are buried with Christ by Baptism into His death, (Rom. 6: 4) and thus become sharers in the infinite grace of the Gospel.

We are pleased to see with what distinctness the author does not hesitate to state what he regards as "the benefits which are secured by the blessing of God upon Infant Baptism to the parties concerned." We have not room for a full quotation. The *second* benefit is *the official removal, from the child properly baptized, of the stain or pollution of native depravity.* The *third* benefit is *the present renewal of the nature of the child, in Christ Jesus, by the Holy Ghost.* The *last* direct benefit which he spe-

cifies is, that God graciously makes such children *the object of His special care,* and *mercifully promises to bestow upon them such spiritual blessings as will promote the growth of the grace granted them at their baptism.* This is very different from the usual style in which modern writers allow that the Holy Ghost makes some good impressions, and exercises some indirect spiritual influences upon the heart through the medium of divine ordinances.

The Treatise throughout is written in an easy, simple, direct and lucid style. It breathes that spirit of tender affection for infant children which only a Christian father can feel who has sympathized with the sufferings of his own little child in sickness, and wept at its open grave. Hence the discussion may be characterized as beautiful and deeply interesting. The reader is carried along with pleasure from beginning to end.

The work is designed for circulation among the people generally; and we commend it to their earnest attention.

E. V. G.

HIMMLISCHER WEIHRAUCHSCHATZ oder Vollstaendiges Gebetbuch auf allerlei Zeiten, Anliegen und Personen anwendbar; mit einem Unterricht vom Gebrauch des Heiligen Abendmahls, Besuchung der Kranken und dazu passende Gebete. Von Johannes Zollikoffer, D. D., von Herisau, Europa.—Vielfaeltig vermehrt und zum Druck befoerdert von A. L. Herman, V. D. M.—Nebst einem starken Anhang Communions-Gebete oder Andachts-Uebungen für fromme und nachdenkende Christen, mit Versen versehen. Neunte Auflage.—Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co. 1859. pp. 688.

John Zollikoffer was a learned, devout and eminent divine, of the Reformed Church, who lived during the latter half of the seventeenth century; and is known by his evangelical sermons, but especially by his *Himmlischer Weihrauchschatz,* a volume of Prayers and Meditations, the ninth American edition of which, edited and enlarged by Rev. Augustus L Herman, has just left the press. These prayers spring from the faith, and are pervaded by the humble, earnest and heavenly spirit of the Heidelberg Catechism. Adapted to daily morning and evening worship, to preparation for and observance of the Holy Communion, to seasons of sickness and misfortune, of health and prosperity, to youth, middle life, and old age, and to the numerous and various occasions of life on which the pious heart would turn to our Father in Heaven through our Lord Jesus Christ in humble confession and earnest supplication, this work has deservedly for a century and a half held the place of a classic among books of devotion in the Reformed Church. The continued circulation of it among the people, can not but pro-

mote sound views in religion, and prove, under the blessing of God, a valuable aid to devotion.

The book, as to paper, letter press, binding, etc., is gotten up in Lippencott's best style; not inferior, indeed, to the handsomest publications in the English language.

E. V. G.

ENDLESS PUNISHMENT: A Special Discourse, delivered Feb. 6th, 1859, by Rev. D. Gans, Pastor of the German Reformed church, Harrisburg, Pa. Harrisburg: "Telegraph" Steam Job Printing Office. 1859. 32 pp.

The main purpose of the Discourse is the development of the two-fold antithesis of the text: *And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal* (Matt. 25: 46). First, the antithesis of *everlasting* (αιωνιον) *punishment* to *life eternal* (αιωνιον), the same term, expressing duration, being used in the original in both members of the passage, though in the first translated *everlasting*, and in the second *eternal;* from which the author argues forcibly that as future *life* is without end, so will future *punishment* be without end. Secondly, the antithesis of *these*—referring to the "goats" (v. 33) or to those "on the left hand" (v. 41)—to *the righteous;* righteousness, or Christ in the man by faith, being the sufficient ground of endless life; and the wickedness of "these," who are "on the left hand" being the sufficient ground of endless punishment. There is no arbitrary decree; but the opposite characters of the two classes lead necessarily to opposite results equally enduring. The presence of Christ, in the one case, is the presence of everlasting life; the absence of Christ, in the other, is the absence of everlasting life. Or, sin, aggravated by unbelief, and eternal death, go together; just as deliverance from sin and deliverance from eternal death.

The argument is well sustained; the train of thought scriptural and practical; and the conclusions legitimate.

E. V. G.

A GRAMMAR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT DICTION: intended as an introduction to the critical study of the Greek New Testament. By *George Benedict Winer.* Translated from the sixth enlarged and improved editon of the original, by Edward Masson, M. A. Vol. I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1859.

Messrs. Clark, father and son, worthy and excellent gentlemen, members of the Free Church of Scotland, are really indefatigable in transferring the best works of recent German theology on British and American soil, without regard to risk and ex-

pense. They have certainly a good claim to a permanent, honorable place in a future history of Anglo-German theology and literature.

Winer's Grammar of the New Testament idiom has long since been a standard work, and is familiarly quoted as an authority by all the modern critical commentators. It created once an epoch in New Testament Exegesis and put a stop to the arbitrary interpretations of rationalism in its vain efforts to bring the evangelists and apostles down to its shallow system. It is the best *grammatical key to the New Testament.* The translation seems to be carefully executed, but embraces so far only about one half of the original.

P. S.

Zwingli, or the Rise of the Reformation in Switzerland. A life of the Reformer, by *R. Christoffel*, Pastor of the Reformed church, Wintersingen, Switzerland. Translated from the German by John Cochran, Esq. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street. 1858. Philadelphia: Smith and English.

A few years ago several Reformed divines of Germany and Switzerland, Dr. Hagenbach of Basel, Drs. Baum and Schmidt of Strassburg, Rev. Messrs. Christoffel of Wintersinger, Pestalozzi of Zurich, Sudhoff of Frankfort, and Stähelin of Rheinfelden, associated for a timely and important literary enterprize, viz: the publication of the lives and labors of the Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church on the Continent of Europe, accompanied with large extracts from their principal writings. So far the lives of Zwingli, Peter Martyr, Olevianus and Ursinus have appeared in three distinct volumes by three authors, Christoffel, Schmidt, and Sudhoff, from the press of Friderichs in Elberfeld.

We are glad to see that the first volume has been translated, and that the other volumes will probably follow in due time. We have now two good biographies of Zwingli in the English language, Hottinger's smaller work, ably and faithfully translated by Prof. Porter, and this new work of my friend and early schoolmate, Christoffel, who has succeeded in giving a very animated photographic delineation of the Swiss reformer. To this must be added the spirited and graphic sketch in the first volume of Mr. Harbaugh's somewhat similar work on the Fathers and Founders of the Reformed Church. (Dr. Mayer's work is not complete even as a history of Zwingli.)

The English translation of Christoffel, as is usual with Clark's publications, surpasses the original in beauty of typographical dress. But we regret that the extracts from his writings, or the entire second part of the original, occupying 350 pages, are

left out entirely. Perhaps it is intended to bring them out in a separate volume. But the translator, Mr. Cochran, gives no intimation to that effect in the preface and is entirely silent on the omission.

P. S.

The Sinlessness of Jesus: An Evidence of Christianity. By Dr. *C. Ullmann.* Translated from the sixth German edition by R. C. Lundin Brown. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. 1859.

Of the nature and object of this excellent apologetic work of Ullmann, we have spoken at length in a sketch on this divine in the book on Germany, its Universities and Divines. We are glad to welcome it in so worthy and attractive an English dress.

P. S.

The Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia: Being a condensed translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopedia, with additions from other sources, by Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., assisted by Distinguished Theologians of various denominations. Part VIII. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blackiston.

The appearance of Part VIII of this great theological work gives renewed assurance, that, with the zeal and diligence of the Editor and his associates, it is making rapid progress towards its final completion. As the work progresses, it becomes more and more evident, that it will take its place among the greatest productions of the age. This much might indeed be expected from a glance at the array of talent enlisted in the enterprize. Yet no one who has not carefully examined the numbers would expect as much interest as they really possess. The conception that many have of an Encyclopedia, is that it is a sort of dictionary of names, dates, statistics, &c., a book of reference, but not a work which one can sit down leisurely to read. That is doubtless the case with many productions bearing the name *Encyclopedia*, but it is not so with the one here noticed. In this are to be found elaborate articles on the most interesting subjects,—articles as fresh and entertaining as those of a Quarterly Review. Indeed we regard each number of the work as more valuable than a number of a standard Quarterly, and for several reasons. In the first place, there are always to be found in it a number of articles equal in length and of equal ability with those in the very best Reviews. In the second place, the articles possess a permanent value and interest, by reason of the authorities always quoted, and the history and statistics furnished. It is a work to read, and a work for reference also in the future. Then, too, it contains a much larger amount of reading matter in each number than is found

in the pages of one number of a Quarterly Review. Once more, all this is to be had for the small price of 50 cents, whereas a Review costs generally 75 cents per number. We make these remarks, not to disparage, in any way, the quarterlies. We regard many of them as worth far more than the subscription price. But this comparison is instituted to bring home to the reader the superior excellence of the Encyclopedia.

The present number extends from *Dogmatics* to *Ezra*. (Not to *Ezra* and *Nehemiah* (!) as the editor of a western religious periodical stated.) Among its many interesting articles may be found the following: *Synod of Dort; The Ebionites;* a paper on *John Eck*, the famons Romanist debater and opponent of Luther; also one on *Jonathan Edwards; Ancient and Modern Egypt;* a fine article on the *English Reformation;* biographical sketch of *Erasmus;* an interesting and instructive article on *Eschatology;* and one on *Eutychianism.*

Imperfections, which pertain to all human productions, might doubtless be pointed out in this work. It would be almost a miricle if all the authorities quoted were in every instance found to be entirely correct. Some articles are wanting, which will doubtless appear under another name. We have read some articles which appeared to us inferior to others, and the theological position of which we could not endorse. But we doubt very much whether any other work in the German or English language in this age, can furnish as faithful and correct an exhibition of the position of genuine Protestant theological science and literature at the present time, as the Encyclopedia here noticed. The translation well sustains the good reputation it has already acquired. The Editor and his associates deserve all praise for their labors in bringing out, in a good English dress, so valuable and standard a work. We hope they may feel encouraged to go forward with the enterprise, and that its circulation may be commensurate with its decided merits.

ANON.

ERRATA IN THE JANUARY NUMBER, 1859.

Page	142,	10th	line from above,	Ampfinzen, read Ampfingen.
"	"	24th	" "	east, read west.
"	"	38th	" "	seigniorories, read seigniories.
"	143	8th	" "	Bipontani, read Bipontini.
"	144	8th	" "	Trives, read Trifels.
"	144	18th	" "	twenty thousand, read two thousand.
"	146	14th	" "	Margraf, read Markgraf.
"	146	18th	" "	Achen, read Aachen.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1859.

Art. I.—THE WONDERFUL NATURE OF MAN.

Science, as it has to do with the world of Nature, unfolds to our view, in every direction, objects and scenes of surpassing interest. Each different province of knowledge is found to embrace a whole universe of wonders, in some sense, within its own separate bounds. Who shall pretend to set limits to the grand significance, in this way, of Astronomy, of Geology, of Chemistry, of Natural History in all its divisions and branches? Nay, who may pretend to exhaust the full sense of any single object or thing, included in these vast fields of scientific research? The relatively small here has its mysteries of wisdom, its miracles of power, no less than the relatively great. Vistas of overwhelming glory, stretching far away in boundless, interminable perspective, open upon us through the microscope and telescope alike. Every drop of water shows itself to be, in the end, an ocean without bottom or shore. The flowers of the field, the leaves of the forest, the worm that crawls upon the ground, the insect that sports its ephemeral life in the air, all, all are telling continually—in full unison with the everlasting mountains, with the rolling waves of the sea, with the starry firmament on high—the endless magnificence of God's creation; the music of earth rising up everywhere, like the sound of many waters, responsive to the music of the spheres, and echoing still forever, in universal triumphant chorus, *The hand that made us is divine.* In whatever direction our eyes are turned, under the guiding light of science, above, beneath, around, we are met with occasions for adoring admiration, and may well be

led to exclaim with the Psalmist: "O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! In wisdom hast Thou made them all; the earth is full of Thy riches."

In the midst of all these wonders of Nature, however, it is easy to see that the central place belongs to *Man* himself. This indeed is plainly signified to us by the Mosaic account of the Creation, in the first chapter of Genesis; where the different parts of the world are represented as coming into existence in a certain order and course; each lower stage opening the way always for a higher, and one part of the process leading over continually to another; until all is made to end at last, on the sixth day, in the formation of Adam—as though the whole work previously had been concerned with the preparation simply of a fit platform or theatre, on which he, the last sense and crowning glory of all, was to be finally ushered into being. On which account, moreover, a new special solemnity is thrown around his advent, a sort of heavenly circumstance and pomp, showing forth sublimely the greatness of the occasion. All else being complete, and the preliminary arrangements of creation brought forward in order to this point, there follows as it were a pause in the process; and then the voice of God is heard once more: "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth." Man thus is declared to be something higher and greater than the whole world of nature besides. He is the head of the natural creation. All its mysteries and glories culminate at last in his person, and find here only their full significance, their proper conclusion and end.

The actual structure of the world, as it unfolds itself continually more and more to the observation of science, is found to be in striking agreement with this ancient representation of the Bible. It is plainly a single system throughout, subject everywhere to the presence of a common law, pervaded universally by the power of a common idea or

thought, and reaching always, with inward restless nisus, toward a common end. The inorganic is in order to the organic. The crystal is a prophecy of the coming plant. Rising continually from lower to higher and more perfect forms of existence, the whole vegetable world serves to foreshadow, in like manner, the sphere of animal life above it. This again is an upward movement throughout, an ever ascending series of types and forms, reaching always toward an ideal, which on to the last it has no power to actualize, but can faintly prefigure only as something far more exalted and far more glorious than itself. The organic order comes to its rest ultimately in Man. He is the true ideal of the world's universal life, the last aim and scope, we may say, of the whole natural creation. He is the fulfilment of all its prophecies, the key to its mysteries, the exposition of its deepest and most hidden sense.

As being then, in such view, the last, full sense and meaning of the world, Man necessarily represents to us its main interest and glory, and must be more worthy of our regard than all it offers besides to our contemplation. It can be no extravagance to say, that his existence and presence in the system of nature set before us the greatest and strangest part of its wonderful constitution—a fact, which surpasses in significance, and transcends in interest, all its other phenomena and facts combined. Man is an object immeasurably more lofty and grand, in the universe of God's works, than the towering hills, the swelling seas, or the stars even, that look down upon him from their infinite distances in the calm, blue vault of heaven. He ranks higher in the scale of creation. He embraces in his being more stupendous realities, profounder mysteries, wider and far more enduring interests. Well might the Hebrew Singer cry out, overwhelmed as it were with the contemplation of his own nature: "I will praise Thee, O Lord; for I am fearfully and wonderfully made: marvellous are Thy works; and that my soul knoweth right well." Yes, of a truth, fearfully and wonderfully made. The declaration applies in full force to the entire being of Man. He

is to be gazed upon with a sort of trembling admiration, first of all, in his simply physical nature; still more so, afterwards, in his intellectual nature; but most of all, finally, in his moral nature—where only, at the last, the full boundless significance of his life, and along with this, the whole terrible sublimity of it also, may be said to burst completely into view.

I. Look at him first in his simply PHYSICAL NATURE. The human body offers itself to our consideration at once, as the greatest and most finished work of God in the outward world. When we compare it with other natural objects, there is none which can be said to be equal to it, or like to it, either in conception or in actual execution and effect.

So under a merely anatomical view. The more closely and carefully we study its conformation and structure, as they are laid open to our observation by the dissecting knife—its framework of bones, its muscles and tendons, its nerves, its curious apparatus of the senses, its organs of action and motion, its marvellous dispositions and arrangements of stomach, lungs, heart, brain, the perfection, in one word, of all its parts, and their most admirable fitness for their several purposes and ends—the more deeply and thoroughly shall we be made to feel, that taken altogether, even in this dead mechanical light, there is indeed nothing so absolutely wonderful and complete, in the whole range of nature besides.

But the case becomes of course still stronger a great deal, when we pass from anatomy to physiology, and fix our attention not simply on the mechanism of the body in a state of rest, but on this same mechanism animated and set in motion everywhere by the powers and forces of life itself, working by it, and through it, for the accomplishment of their proper ends. Such a sphere of wonders is here thrown open to our contemplation, as may be easily seen at once to leave far behind, in significance and interest, all that can be brought into comparison with it under any like physical form. Vast as the powers of nature may show themselves in other quarters, grand as the scale of

their action may be, and however much of strange, amazing mystery may seem to enter into their processes, they bring after all no such results to pass anywhere, as can be said to match in any measure what is going forward continually in the living constitution of the human body.

What, for example, is the chemistry of nature, its dark mysterious processes going forward always in the deep places of the earth, its laboratory of wonders in the air and in the sky—where the winds are born—where the clouds come and go—where rain, snow, hail, lightning, and tempest issue continually from the same awful womb; what is all this, we say, in comparison with what is taking place every day in every such living body, by the process of digestion and assimilation; through which, all sorts of foreign material are received, in the shape of food, into the stomach, wrought silently into blood, and converted out of this finally into the very substance of all the different parts of the system—meeting thus its perpetual waste with perpetual renovation and supply.

What is the ocean, with its world-embracing circulation —its waters lifted into the air, borne in every direction by the clouds, made to descend in showers upon the earth, gathered into streams, and poured at last through mighty rivers back again into their original bed; what is "this great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts," where the ships go, and where leviathan is made to play; what is the whole of it at last, in all its greatness, over against that wonder of wonders, the human heart, with its tidal flow of blood kept up day and night, and year after year, through the arteries and the veins!

What is the action of the winds, which come no one can tell whence, and go no one can tell whither, now fanning the earth in gentle zephyrs, and now sweeping over the face of it in hurricanes and storms, penetrating all things, purifying all things, stirring all things into motion and life; what is the action of the winds, we ask again, in this outward view, compared with the proper breath of life in

man, received through his nostrils, and made to fulfil its unresting twofold ministry by the marvellous economy of his lungs?

Or the still more subtle forces of electricity and magnetism, as they are found to be constantly and powerfully at work everywhere, through the universal realm of nature, or as they are made to perform miracles, at the present day, in obedience to the will of science and art; what are they, under either view, in comparison with the brain of man, and its dependent system of nerves, extending with infinite ramification to all parts of the body, and causing the whole to be filled at every point, and through every instant of time, with the unity of a common life?

It is true indeed, that these physiological wonders themselves come before us, to a certain extent, on the outside of man's nature. They belong to the animal world in general. Here too the phenomena of sentient life, upheld and carried forward by organs and functions strangely adapted to its use, challenge in every direction our profound admiration. Bodily senses are here, vital activities, powers of digestion, secretion, and self-reparation, blood coursing through arteries and veins, the curious play of lungs, and the working more curious still of nerves and brain. Many animals seem even to surpass man, in particular aspects and features of their organization. He is excelled by some in strength; by others, in speed; by others again, in special forms of natural art and ingenuity. Some have a more quick and acute sense of hearing; others a far more keen and wide reaching vision. In all directions around him, they show themselves qualified and fitted for modes of existence, which are for him impossible altogether. But all this detracts nothing in the end from the proper superiority of his being, even in that merely physical view with which only we are now concerned. For it is easy enough to see, that any points of advantage which may seem to belong to other animal organizations hold only in single subordinate particulars; going thus to show the comparatively partial and narrow order of their life; while in any

whole view, considered either singly or collectively, they fall short, immeasurably, we may say, of the full proportioned harmony and perfection of the human body. Their completeness in all cases is something relative only, the dim foreshadowing of something higher and greater than itself, a defective onesided approximation at best to the idea of the absolute under some entirely different form. Thus do these organizations, in fact, give glory to the body of man from all sides, doing homage to it as being far more honorable than themselves, and proclaiming it to be, what it is in truth, the complement and crown of the whole physical creation.

In this view, it is not in virtue of his spiritual nature simply, that man is to be considered the end and consummation of the present world. As a physical system, it comes to its conclusion, first of all, in the organization of his body, through which alone it can make room for his presence under any higher form. Toward this grand final result, accordingly, all its processes may be said to reach and struggle from the beginning; while the universal order of things, as they now stand, finds here also its proper meaning and full central rest, through all time. Even the vast geologic periods, which are supposed to have gone before the creation of the world in its present form, are not shut out from the force of this rule. Through all its precious, grand, and mighty cycles, the history of the earth, as it remains still written in the rocks, was one long course of preparation for what it was brought to be finally, in being made a fit abode for man; and the signification of its manifold forms of life, its successive worlds of animated nature— rude, imperfect, and often monstrous as they were— lay mainly in this, that they served to anticipate and prefigure in their way, through the ages, the living order of the world as it is now, and so looked through this continually to the advent of man himself, by which, in the fulness of time all was to be conducted at last to its proper end.

This is sufficient to show, what small account is to be

made of mere outward powers or magnitudes in nature, set over against the living person of man. He stands before us, intrinsically greater, in his bodily organization itself, than all the geologic creations, which served so many ages beforehand to prepare the way for his coming. They were in order to him throughout; and in such view could be only of secondary and subordinate rank, as compared with him, in the scale of creation. We need not wonder then, if the whole world, in its constitution, be found owning and confessing his superior dignity in the same way. The forms and processes of nature converge from all sides toward man as their grand centre, and gather themselves up finally in his person. He is the world concentrated, consolidated, reduced to its last most comprehensive unity. All its elements and forces come together, we may say, in the wonderful constitution of his body; which becomes in this way a microcosm, the world in its inmost essence, reflecting and showing forth continually the sense of what it is in its widest macrocosmic view. Man unites in himself thus the powers of the whole creation around him. All cosmical influences stream into him and through him. Fire, earth, air, and water, mingle in his composition. The majesty of his nature, in such view, towers above the everlasting hills. Winds, cloud, storms, volcanoes, and earthquakes, do homage to his presence, proclaiming it to be something greater than themselves. The broad ocean of life, spread out in the animal world beneath him, rolls toward him, in like manner, its universal tribute of respect. Reptiles, fishes, birds, and four-footed beasts, join in seeking his presence and heralding his praise. He is said, indeed, actually to travel through all these orders of existence in his embryonic state, beginning with the lowest conformation, and passing up through the highest finally into his own proper human shape; a process, that involves in every case, a resumption or new taking up, as it were, of the life of the world in its lower forms—curiously repeating in this way the original work of creation, and verifying in the most striking manner the idea of its organic oneness and whole-

ness, as we have it so graphically represented in the old Mosaic record.

Among all the works of God in the world, then, there is none which may be considered comparable, in dignity and perfection, to the human body. How could it be otherwise, if nature was to become in this form the shrine of intelligence, the organ of thought, the dwelling place of free, self-conscious mind? Must it not, for any such purpose as this, be raised into its highest state, and wrought into its most perfect mould, so as to be made as nearly as possible analogous and conformable to the quality of that superior life, with which it was to be so mysteriously conjoined? Must not the temple of the soul, in the midst of the natural world, be so framed and ordered, as to be, even in its own merely physical constitution, more honorable and glorious than the whole world of nature besides? The primacy of man in the world, the proper sovereignty of his nature, is not a prerogative belonging to him through his soul only; it comes into view most immediately, and first of all, in his body also. That of itself proclaims him at once monarch and lord of creation. His erect form, his countenance lifted heavenward, the harmony and symmetry of his parts, his firm walk, his commanding port, his spiritual aspect, the lightning of his eye, the moral thunder of his voice—all announce his imperial distinction, and authenticate his title to universal reverence and respect.

One other thought here we have no right to pass by, as going to show, beyond all that we have yet said, the incomparable excellence and worth of the human body. God has put infinite honor upon it, through the mystery of the Incarnation. "Tu ad liberandum suscepturus hominem," the Church sings in her grand, old Ambrosian Hymn, "non horruisti Virginis uterum." The Word became flesh, and was made in the likeness of men! Simply to state this awful fact is enough, in the present connection.

II. Wonderful and glorious as man may be, however, in his physical constitution, his mere bodily organization—either considered in itself, or viewed in its relations to the

world of nature on the one side and the world of mind or spirit on the other—he is found to be a great deal more glorious and wonderful still in his INTELLECTUAL NATURE.

Nature is in order to Mind. All her productions and processes look toward this continually, in the way of general direction, as their common end. It is as though thought or intelligence lay bound and imprisoned in her mighty empire of laws and forms, and were forever struggling to rise by means of them into the clear, full possession of its own life. We have seen already how this universal order comes to its conclusion physically in the human body, showing it to be thus the summit and crown of the natural creation. But that first conclusion is itself only in order to another and far higher end, the revelation of the human soul in the world as a new order of existence altogether. Nature culminates in the physical constitution of man, just because she can rise no higher in her own sphere, and there at last, if ever, must come into communion with free self-active mind. This it is which constitutes in fact the perfection and dignity of the human body, that it stands so nearly related to the world of mind in its whole conformation, and is so eminently fitted to become the organ and medium of its presence in the world of nature. Here, accordingly, the necessary complement of the body, and the last full meaning of the world, are reached at the same time in the knowing and reasoning soul of man; in rising to which, however, nature must be regarded as transcending herself, efflorescing as it were into a higher life, and so finding her end in another system of existence altogether.

Grand and magnificent, beyond the power of language to express, is the epiphany of Mind in this way, pouring its effulgence over the dark face of nature. It is equivalent in truth to the rising of a new sun in the universe, far more glorious than that which rules the day in its common form. When God commanded the light to shine out of darkness in the beginning, dispersing the deep night of chaos, and opening the way for its transformation into a

world of order and beauty, it was after all an imperfect symbol only of what took place in a higher form, when "the Lord God formed Man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life," causing him to become thus, through his own inspiration, a rational and intelligent soul. It was as if the whole work of creation, in its previous form, had been suddenly flooded with fresh heavenly light, and kindled into new sense. For such in truth is the mysterious relation, which mind, as it lives and reigns in man, sustains through all time to the outward material world. In a profound sense, it may be said actually to make the world, imparting to it its whole form and meaning as it now stands. Not as if the system of nature had no existence, on the one side of man's intelligence and thought. It has a being of its own, we believe, apart from all such apprehension. But what that is, we can never either know or guess. It offers to our contemplation nothing better than thick, impenetrable darkness. In such view, it is for us as though it did not exist at all. To become real for us, in any way, the world must not only *be;* it must come into us also in the way of knowledge; and the forms of this knowledge, in the nature of the case, can be imparted to it only by our own minds. It is for us, therefore, only what it is made to be through our intelligence itself, and nothing more. Not only so; but we must say the world itself is made for this mode of existence—what it comes to be by entering into the types and moulds of actual knowledge—as its only true and full perfection; so that, short of this, it must ever be a rude and unformed mass, carrying in it no right sense, and representing no proper reality whatever. Thus it is that the whole world is literally brought out of darkness into marvellous light, and reduced at the same time to full order and form, by the power of intelligence made to bear upon it through the mind of man. In the waking of consciousness, all nature may be said to wake together with him into new life. It takes shape everywhere in conformity with his perception and thought. It shines, and blooms, and sings, in obedi-

ence to the magical authority of his spirit. It lives, and has its being—such phenomenal being as we know it by—only in the orb of his mind.

We have seen before, that the physical creation centres in the human body; and that this may well be dignified with the title of *microcosm*, for this reason, as gathering up into itself finally all the forms and forces of nature in its larger view, and so representing in small compass its universal sense. But what is all this, in comparison with the centralization that is here exhibited to us, in the constitution of the human soul? By this emphatically it is, that man becomes in the fullest sense a living microcosm, taking up into himself the very being of the great and mighty world around him, and so reflecting and showing forth the full sense of it, as it is not possible for it to be known in any other way. The vast, the manifold, the multitudinous in nature, is not simply reduced here to relatively small bounds, as in the other case; it is brought down to absolute unity, and so made to pass away entirely in another order of existence altogether. In such view, the microcosm is more than the macrocosm—the world intelligible than the world diffused and spread abroad in space; since it is wholly by the first alone, that the latter can ever be at all, what it seems to be in any such outward form. Here, therefore, mere physical bulk and force, set over against the being of man, shrink into still greater insignificance than before. Are not mountains and seas, bellowing thunders, roaring cataracts and storms, comprehended truly in his spirit, and made to pass through it, in order that they may be for him either outward or real? Why then should he stand aghast before *them*, and not feel rather in them, and by them, the yet more awful grandeur and overwhelming vastness of his own nature. Mind is infinitely greater than all that is not mind, enlarge the conception of this as we may. It towers above the whole material creation. It outshines the stars. It is a force more active and powerful by far, than that which bears along comets and planets in their course. The sun itself, in all its majestic splendor, is

an object less high and glorious, than the soul even of an infant, carrying in it the latent power of thought, the undeveloped possibility of reason.

We have spoken of the physical action of the brain, as something greatly more wonderful than that of the most subtle forces in nature under any different form. But what is this in its turn, when we come to compare it with the activity of thinking itself, which, however it may depend upon the working of the brain, is yet not that simply, but another order of force and energy altogether? Thought is more free than air, more penetrating than fire, more irresistible and instantaneous in motion than lightning. It travels at a rate, which causes the velocity of light to appear sluggish and slow. It traverses the earth, and sweeps the heavens, at a single bound. In the twinkling of an eye, it passes to the planet Saturn, to the sun, to the star Sirius, to the utmost bounds of the universe.

We have spoken of the circulation of the blood, as something more fearfully grand than the waters above the firmament, and the waters under the firmament, revolving continually through the heart-resembling ministry of oceans and seas. But what is all this to the mystery of consciousness—that broad, unfathomable sea in the human spirit, which serves to set in motion all its activities and powers, out of whose depths all knowledges proceed, and into whose bosom again they continually return!

Every faculty of the mind is a subject for admiration, from mere sensation up to the use of reason in its purest and most perfect form. The images of conception, the reproductions of fancy, the new combinations and grand creative processes of the imagination, the operations of judgment, the intuitional apprehensions involved in the power of ideas—time would fail us, to speak of them in any way of particular detail; but what realms of interest, what worlds of thrilling wonder, do they not all throw open to our view!

Let any one consider only for a moment what is continually going forward within us, in the familiar process which

is known to us by the name of memory. Nothing so simple, it might seem, at first view; and yet, the moment we stop to think of it, nothing more profoundly mysterious and strange. Images and thoughts are continually entering the consciousness of the mind, and then disappearing from it again, as though they were entirely lost. But they are in fact only buried, and hidden away, in the secret depths of the mind itself, so as to be capable of being resuscitated, and called back again, whenever their presence may be required; and in this way they are in truth all the time coming and going, appearing and disappearing, in our ordinary thinking. What we hold in our intelligence thus is only in small part ever contained in our actual consciousness, at any given time. By far the most of it is in us always under a latent, slumbering form. And yet all enters into our spiritual being, is truly part of ourselves, and goes to make up continually the proper contents of our personality. But what a marvel this is; that so much of our knowledge should be in the mind, and yet out of mind, at the same time; that our sense of self should hold joined with it in this way such a vast multitude of conceptions, thoughts, and ideas, such a whole world of past experiences and affections, which nevertheless are in general as much unperceived as though they did not exist at all, and only come into view occasionally and transiently, ever rising and ever sinking, ever entering and ever departing—an endless succession of vanishing forms, in what remains throughout after all the indivisible, unbroken unity of one and the same consciousness. To stand on the shore of such an ocean to look forth on its broad, boundless expanse—to send the imagination down among the secrets that lie buried, far out of sight, in its dark and silent depths—may indeed well produce in any thoughtful mind an overwhelming sentiment both of astonishment and awe. There is neither heighth nor depth, nor show of vastness and sublimity under any other form, in the simply physical world that may bear to be placed in comparison with it for a single moment.

The case swells upon us into its full significance, only when we come to ask, Can that which has once been in the mind, so as to be part and parcel of its consciousness, ever so pass out of it again as to sink into everlasting oblivion? Some thoughts, we know, return upon us readily and easily in our ordinary experience, lying as it were near at hand to us all the time; others are recalled with more difficulty, as having got farther out of reach; while others again, the largest class of all, seem to have sunk like lead in the mighty waters, to be remembered by us no more forever. But who will pretend to distinguish here, between what is still within the reach of memory, and what has become for it thus as though it had never been? Who will undertake to say at what point of time, or under what terms and conditions otherwise, that which has once been the property of the spirit, in the way of thought, shall be so sundered and alienated from it as to pass irrecoverably and entirely out of its possession? The grand wonder is, how the past should return at all, and become thus the matter of present consciousness and knowledge—a thing past and yet present at the same time; that it should do so after a short interval, or do so after a long one, would seem to be in the case a distinction of no material account. If the power of memory may bridge in this way the chasm of an hour, why not with equal ease the oblivion of a year, or the dark void of a thousand years? We know in fact, that what has thus slumbered in us through long periods of time does often wake up within our consciousness at last, in the most surprising manner. In old age especially, nothing is more common than such a resurrection of long buried images and thoughts. In many cases, the circumstances and experiences of childhood and early youth, after being forgotten for scores of years, are so restored to memory again as to seem only of recent date. Persons recovered from drowning have said, that in the middle state to which they were brought between life and death, a whole world of such buried recollections seemed to pass before them in panoramic vision. We have been told of others,

who, in circumstances of extreme danger, falling from a precipice for instance, or exposed to the jaws of death in some like violent way, have had their whole past lives, as it appeared, brought back upon them with a sort of instantaneous rush. Who, in view of such cases, may presume to limit the possibilities of memory? And who that thinks of it may not well be filled with amazement, rising even to terror itself, in considering what is involved for himself, in the awful abyss, which is found thus yawning before him continually in the depths of his own soul?

III. But it is in his MORAL NATURE most of all, that Man comes before us finally in the full terrible sublimity of his being—"fearfully and wonderfully made," beyond all the wonders of creation under any different form.

There is a close, necessary connection, of course, between the moral and the intellectual. Reason and Will, thought and action, flow together, and as it were interpenetrate each other continually, in the constitution of the mind. There can be no act of intelligence without volition; and there can be no exercise of volition without intelligence. Still thinking and willing are not the same thing; and there is full room, therefore, for distinguishing between the intellectual nature of man as based upon his reason, and the moral nature of man, as based upon his will. It is easy enough to see, moreover, that the relation is of such a kind as to place the moral nature, in point of dignity and worth, above the intellectual. If it be asked, where the economy of the mind is to be regarded as coming to its main end, its grand ultimate purpose and meaning, the answer must be, in that part of it which is represented to us by the idea of the will. Thought is rightly in order to action; knowledge in order to freedom. The practical reason is greater than the speculative reason. Truth in the understanding must become truth in the will also, if it is ever to be either spirit or life.

We have seen already, that the human mind is in fact the revelation in the world of a new order of existence altogether; a result, which serves to satisfy and fulfil the uni-

versal sense of the physical creature, struggling up to it through all its realms of existence, and that might seem to be thus, in one view, the last product of this process itself; while it is yet plain, that in reaching it nature is actually carried beyond itself, and met, as it were, in its own sphere by the power of a higher life, descending into it from above. Considered as the mere passive counterpart of nature under a spiritual view—the mirror simply of its multitudinous forms, the echo only of its manifold voices and sounds —such a manifestation is indeed wonderful in the highest degree. But the full force of the wonder comes into view, only when we look beyond this, and see the mind to be at the same time a fountain of power, a principle of free spontaneous action, in its own nature, not only open to impressions receptively from the world around, but capable also of working back upon the world again, and as it were over against it, in the most original and independent way. This is the idea of the *Will*.

There is no power or force like it, under any other form, in the system of creation. Physically considered, the world is a constitution carried forward in the way of inward, settled and fixed law, causes producing effects continually, and effects following causes, with a certainty which admits of no variation or exception. The whole process, in such view, is necessary, blind, and unfree. So in the sphere of mere lifeless matter; so in the sphere of vegetation; and so in the sphere also of animal life. The actions of animals are determined absolutely by influences exerted upon them from without, through their natural appetites and instincts. Neither is the case different with the animal nature of man, in itself considered. This likewise stands connected with the physical world by organic relations, which involve the same kind of subjection to its laws that is found to prevail in lower spheres. Appetite, desire, inclination, passion, in man, are in this view, so far as their original form is concerned, responses simply to other forces in the system of nature, and as such include in themselves neither light nor freedom. The difference here,

however, is the conjunction in which these forms of merely natural life are set with a power above nature in man, which may indeed lend itself to their service in a base passive way, but whose rightful prerogative it is rather to rule them always in subserviency to its own ends. This power, the practical reason—the will in its proper form—is no agency that serves merely to carry into effect, what has been made necessary by the working of causes going before. If that were the case, it would at once lose its distinctive character, and be nothing more at last than the continuation of nature itself, under a new sublimated and refined form. But the very conception of will implies and involves the contrary of this. It is, by its very constitution, a self-determining power. It is no blind, necessary force, like the laws of nature, but a free, spontaneous activity, which knows itself, and moves itself optionally its own way; giving rise thus to a whole universe of relations, interests, actions and systems of action, which but for such origination could have no existence whatever, and which, however it may be joined with the constitution of nature, and made to rest upon it in some sense as a basis, is nevertheless in fact a new world altogether of far higher and far more glorious character.

Let it be considered only, for a moment, what this *hyperphysical* economy—the moral world as distinguished from the world of nature—is found to comprehend and contain. It comprises in itself all the powers, functions, and operations of mind; the thinking of men; their purposes and aims; their affections, emotions, and passions; their acts of whatever kind, whether inward only or extending out into the surrounding world; the full unfolding and putting forth, in one word, of all that is involved in their spiritual being. In it are embraced, at the same time, the idea of society, the order of the family, the constitution of the State, the organization finally of the Church; all social, political, and religious relations; all virtues and opposing vices; all human privileges, duties, and rights. It is the sphere emphatically thus, of whatever is comprehended in the conception of education and history; being made up mainly in

fact, not so much of present experiences simply at any given time, as of a whole world rather of past experiences, consolidated together, and handed forward continually from one generation to another. What a mass of material, accumulated in this way through ages, goes to form the proper ethical life of civilized nations—the historical substance, we may call it, of their nationality—strangely treasured up in their language, their institutions and laws, their manners and customs, their traditions and hereditary memories of the ancient past. Among animals their is no education, and no history. The ideas are purely and exclusively human. They belong only to the world of intelligence and freedom.

We have spoken of the self-moving nature of the will, its independence of all outward constraint, its power to originate action in its own way. This freedom, however, forms only one side of its marvellous constitution. Under another view, it is just as much bound by the force of necessary law, as the constitution of matter itself. The only difference in the two cases is, that in nature the law carries itself into effect as it were by its own force, while in the moral world it cannot go into effect at all, unless by the free choice and consent of the will itself which it thus necessitates and binds. The necessity, to prevail at all, must pass into the form of freedom. But this does not detract in the least from the idea of its authority and force. The distinction serves only, in truth, to clothe it with greater dignity and glory. In this view, the law of nature, in all its generality and constancy, is but the type, in a lower sphere, of the universal and unchangeable character of the law, as it exists for freedom in a higher sphere. The first mystically adumbrates, for all thoughtful minds, the wonderful presence of the second. Some such thought seems to have been in the mind of the ancient Psalmist, when he was led to exclaim: "Forever, O Lord, Thy word is settled in heaven! Thy faithfulness is unto all generations; Thou hast established the earth, and it abideth." How many have been made to feel at times, in the same way, the sense

of God's glorious moral government mirrored upon them from the contemplation of the natural world.

"There are two things," the celebrated philosopher Kant was accustomed to say, "which I can never sufficiently wonder at and admire—the starry heavens above me, and the moral law within me." The thought is at once beautiful and profound; for there can be no more fitting image, in truth, of the grandeur and sublimity of this inward law, than that which is offered to our gaze in the silent, tranquil, ever during majesty of the stars.

Along with the presence of the law again, in this department of our being, comes into view what is in some respects the most wonderful part of our whole nature, the power with which we are so familiar under the name of conscience. As a necessary and binding rule for freedom, it lies in the very conception of the moral law, that it should be able to assert its presence, and make its authority felt, in the mind itself, and not be brought near to it merely in the character of an outward and foreign force. And thus it is in truth, that the will is found to be actually autonomic, affirming and laying down in one direction the very rule, which it feels itself called upon to obey in another. Not as if it could be supposed actually to originate the law in this way, according to its own pleasure. That would be a monstrous imagination, subverting the whole idea of morality. The will does not make the law; but still it is through it alone, that the law comes to any positive legislation in the soul. In no other way, can the full force of the categorical imperative, *Thou shalt*, be brought fairly home to its consciousness. What a strange spectacle, then, we have exhibited to us here. Two forces in the same mind, transacting with one another in such solemn personal way. Here the will commands; while there again the very same will is required to obey. Nor is that all. The power that legislates in the case, goes on also to sit in judgment on its own conduct, and then to execute sentence upon itself according to the result of such trial. Obedience brings at once self-approbation, and is followed with

peace. Disobedience leads just as certainly to self-condemnation and self-inflicted pain. Such is the terrific mystery of conscience—the knowing of God brought into man's knowing of himself, and made to be thus an inseparable part of his proper spiritual being and life.

We conclude the whole subject with the obvious reflection, that the richest and most interesting field of science for man, is that which is offered to him in the constitution of his own person, and especially in the constitution of his person under its ethical or moral view. The world may be worthy of our thoughts and studies, in its other aspects; but it can be properly so, at all times, only as it is studied, under such aspects, with full regard to what must ever be considered its last central interest in the form now stated. No wonders of the simply outward creation, no mysteries of mere nature, can ever signify as much for us, as the world we carry about with us continually in our own being.

Lancaster, Pa. J. W. N.

Art. II.—THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

The incarnate Son of God lived and died for the good of men. His entire life was sacrificial—pre-eminently so His death. The spotless victim, offered upon the cross, was an all-sufficient ransom for the sins of the world. "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us." The atonement was full and complete; but its application to the redemption of the world was yet to be accomplished. Jesus Christ would not leave the work unfinished. Prior to His ascension, He made provision for the successful prosecution of His mediatorial work, in

the establishment of the Church, the appointment of its holy ordinances, the institution of the ministry, and its prospective investiture with official power and authority. The great commission was given to His chosen disciples by the risen Redeemer, and subsequently confirmed and sealed to them in the baptism of the Holy Ghost (Acts 1: 8 and 2: 1–4). Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world—Amen." (Matth. 28: 18–20.)

The general official authority thus given by our Lord to His apostles and their successors, includes several particulars: the mediatorial dignity of Jesus—the great commission itself, springing out of this supreme authority—and, the promise of Christ, attached to the commission, and necessary to a successful prosecution of the ministerial work. Instead of taking up and discussing these points separately, in the order here given, we propose to develop the sense of the entire commission, in a series of consecutive propositions. We observe,

1. *That Jesus Christ, as Mediator of the New Covenant, claims for Himself supreme power and dominion.*

Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, all power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. The word "power," as here employed, is to be taken in its widest and most comprehensive sense—including every thing necessary to the mediatorial government of the world. It is accordingly said to be "given" unto Him—given or delegated for some specific purpose. It does not, in this peculiar sense, belong to Him naturally and of necessity. Nor was it given to Him particularly as the "Son of God;" for, as such, He is "heir of all things," and consequently in possession of all divine perfections: nor was it delegated to Him, even in a *figurative* sense, simply as the "Son of man;" for, as such, He could not safely wield, even in a

limited, lower and rationalistic sense, a power and authority so boundless and far-reaching. This supreme power was given Him, as Mediator of the New Covenant—Jesus of Nazareth—the God-man—crucified, and risen, and exalted to the right hand of the Majesty on High, and *so* constituted Redeemer of the world, and "Head of the Church." This view of the subject we shall find abundantly confirmed by the clear and uniform testimony of the sacred Scriptures.

Already in the Old Testament we find occasional descriptions of this glory—glimpses of the Redeemer's majesty and grace. He is there represented as being "fairer than the sons of men," and "higher than the kings of the earth." The loftiest and most sublime inspirations of the ancient bards, prophets, and men of God generally, are to be traced to an overwhelming sense of this divine majesty of Israel's coming Prince!—"Then," says David, "Thou spakest in vision to thy Holy one, and saidst, I have laid help upon one that is mighty: I have exalted one chosen out of the people. My faithfulness and my mercy shall be with Him, and in my name shall His horn be exalted." Isaiah celebrates the coming glory of One whose name should be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, and Prince of Peace—of the increase of whose government and peace there should be no end. And Daniel, in one of his splendid visions, saw One, looming up before him "like unto the Son of man," and "there was given unto Him dominion and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, and nations, and languages should serve him: whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and whose kingdom shall not be destroyed." In the expressive language of Solomon, He is "the CHIEF among ten thousand."

When we come to the New Testament, we find these evidences of Christ's mediatorial dignity and power constantly increasing, both in number and distinctness. His conception was by the Holy Ghost—the power of the Most High overshadowing the Virgin. His birth was announced

by a convoy of angels. At His baptism, the Holy Ghost, under an expressive symbol, visibly descended upon the Redeemer and consecrated Him to His holy office; and a voice, coming from the excellent glory, said; "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." The same public testimony was given Him on the Mount of transfiguration; and also, substantially, at His death upon the cross. He was "declared to be the Son of God, with power, by His resurrection from the dead;" and His ascension to heaven impressed the seal of Divine approbation upon all previous testimonies, and constituted Him both "Lord and Christ." Peter tells us that He was exalted to be a Prince and Saviour, to give repentance unto Israel and remission of sins." And Stephen, the first martyr, when in peril of life, "saw the heavens open, and Jesus standing at the right hand of God." Of Him Paul says, that He is the "blessed and only Potentate;" and the beloved John, in a still more glowing description, says that "He has on His vesture and on His thigh this name written: KING OF KINGS AND LORD OF LORDS."

Such are the testimonies, which abound in the word of God, as to the mediatorial dignity of Jesus Christ. That these exalted powers and prerogatives belong to Him as the glorified "Head of the Church," is clear from what Paul says: "That God hath set Him at His own right hand, in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come; and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fulness of Him which filleth all in all." This passage is so clear and forcible, that it requires no comment. In his Epistle to the Philippians, the same Apostle tells us, that, "being in the form of God," Jesus "thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet made Himself of no reputation, but took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and, being found in fashion as a man, He humbled Himself, and

became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; *wherefore* God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." And again, in a different connection, he says of the Redeemer, that He is the "Head of the body—the Church," and the "beginning—the first-born from the dead, that, in all things, He might have the pre-eminence; for, it pleased the Father, that in Him should all fulness dwell," for the reconciliation of the world unto Himself, by the "blood of His cross."

Such, then, being the supreme power and dignity of Jesus Christ, He teaches further,

2. *That, as Head of the Church, and in virtue of His supreme power and dominion, Christ gave commission to the Apostles and their successors.*

"All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth; go ye, therefore," &c. The commission is based expressly on the authority "given" and the powers vested in Him as Head of the Church, of course, including in it, and guaranteeing to the Apostles all that He Himself possessed, in so far as this was either communicable, or necessary to the successful prosecution of the ministerial work. It is so with all official documents or investitures. They guaranty to the recipients all the powers, rights, and immunities, over which the giver has any control, and in so far as they relate to the accomplishment of the objects contemplated. Otherwise an investing with official authority would be of no practical use or account. The case requires a commission which really and in fact guaranties and *confers* the necessary powers and prerogatives.

With these preliminary remarks, let us proceed to inquire: What is, and what is not, included in the apostolic commission. I shall of course adduce only a few of the many testimonies which refer to this interesting subject.

"As the Father hath sent me, EVEN SO send I you," says

Christ; "And when He had said this, He breathed on them, and said unto them: receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Such was the formal investiture of the Apostles with the ministerial office and its solemn prerogatives. And, as neither the Apostles, nor any of their successors after them, ever possessed or even claimed to possess, in and of themselves, power to remit sins; it follows, that this power, whatever it be, is delegated and guarantied to them and their successors, in office, *only* as ministers of Christ, acting under His commission, and in exact accordance with the terms of that commission. This power resides in Christ only and exclusively, and is dispensed by Him to his chosen instruments, in such measure and way as may best accord with His sovereign will and purpose. This is indicated in His breathing upon them, and saying to them prophetically: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," in the light and power of whose agency *only* the duties of the ministry can be duly and efficiently discharged.

This full and final investiture took place after His resurrection and shortly before His ascension to heaven, and finds its completion, formally, in the words of the great commission. But, as in all other important cases, so here also, we have prospective intimations or preliminary parts of the solemn investiture already long before His death and resurrection. Thus, in His reply to the celebrated confession of Peter, He says: "Upon this rock will I build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Such is the Saviour's language to Peter. That it does not belong to Him exclusively is clear, from the repetition of the same words, substantially, to *all* His disciples afterwards, in such a way as to show that the *entire Church*, in all ages, was equally interested in this power, delegated to her legitimate office-

bearers. In giving directions relative to the exercise of Church discipline, and the binding nature and deep solemnity of all such disciplinary acts, as were performed in the name of Christ and according to His word and will, He concludes in this remarkable manner: "Verily, I say unto you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." Then, in order to show that such acts are precisely of the same nature and force, morally, as if He Himself had performed them, He proceeds thus: "Again, I say unto you, that if two or three of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven; for where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."

"The keys of the kingdom of heaven," as referred to above, signify and represent the official prerogatives of the Christian ministry—the power to preach the Gospel and exercise discipline—even as "keys" have been, in all ages of the world, the appropriate symbols of official station and authority, and, the *delivery* of keys to any one, the *formal investiture* of the person with the office, civil or ecclesiastical, and with all its varied powers and resources. This idea is brought out very strikingly in a passage relating, prophetically and symbolically, to our Saviour Himself, and describing thus His own investiture with the mediatorial office. "I will commit thy government into his hands," says God concerning Eliakim, "and he shall be a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and to the house of Judah. And the *key* of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder; so he shall open, and none shall shut; and he shall shut and none shall open." This language the Redeemer applies to Himself (Rev. 3: 7) expressly to indicate His supreme power and authority; and with such power—power to kill and power to make alive, (2 Cor. 2: 15–16) instrumentally at least—with such power the Lord Jesus prospectively invested His chosen disciples, when "He breathed on them, and said: Receive ye the Holy

Ghost;" and, on the day of Pentecost, this promised power from on high came upon them in "tongues of fire," and qualified them to preach in all the world with divine energy and success "the unsearchable riches of Christ."

It may possibly be said: This is a tremendous power to be committed to the officers of the Church! Grant that it is a tremendous power; but what of that? It is clearly and undeniably given to the Heralds of the cross—the "ambassadors for Christ." Besides, we may ask, What would their office be *worth* without such powers and prerogatives? What is a civil or any other office worth, unless it secures and guaranties to the incumbents the necessary powers effectually to execute the office and accomplish the work which the office contemplates? And we ask again, what is the Christian ministry worth, practically, and what can it accomplish, without such plenary power as we have shown and proven to have been given or delegated by Christ to His Apostles, and their successors in office? Our high calling and awfully responsible work is to save souls, by bringing them into a vital relation to God through Jesus Christ. For the accomplishment of this super-human work, we need super-human power and influence. And, blessed be God, we have (and by right *ought* to have) power guarantied to us, in our great commission, effectually to accomplish the important ends contemplated in our high and holy calling; and no man, who is either ashamed, or afraid, to own and assert it, when necessary, is fit for the ministry! Paul thought and acted far otherwise. He cherished far nobler views respecting his office and its power to accomplish good! "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ," says he, "for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth—to the Jew first and also to the Greek." He gloried in his high calling. "I magnify mine office," he exclaims in another connection; and, in view of its solemn responsibilities, he says: "Our sufficiency is of God." On the ground of its lofty and excellent character, he claims for himself and

others, in the sacred office, proper respect and obedience in the Lord. "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ, an stewards of the mysteries of God." On the same general ground also he solicits for himself and his "companions in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ" an unprejudiced hearing. It is a "ministry of reconciliation;" and, *because* God hath "committed unto us the word of reconciliation," he says, we are "*ambassadors of Christ;*" and for this reason, feel authorized and bound to urge men to become "reconciled to God." Solemn and responsible trust; "for we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish. To the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life: and who is sufficient for these things?"

Such is the Christian ministry with its dread powers and responsibilities. It comes directly from Christ, and contemplates the redemption of the world. Hence we learn,

3. *That this commission authorizes, and requires, of the Apostles and their successors, to teach or make disciples of all nations.*

"Go ye, therefore, and teach," i. e., bring into the school of Christ and under His authority, "all nations." From the deep solemnity of the ministerial office it will be readily inferred, that the end or object to be accomplished by it must be of primary importance; and so it is found to be in fact. It is nothing less than the spiritual conquest of the world—its reduction under the authority of Jesus Christ. The commission extends to the whole human race —to "all nations," and to each individual of all nations—to "every creature." In connection with the original call, extended to the Apostles, the Saviour, with evident allusion to their former occupation, said: "I will make you fishers of men." When, on a subsequent occasion, He sent them forth on a kind of first missionary tour, He indeed restricted their labors "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel;" but in the great commission given after His resurrection, there is no such restriction: on the contrary,

He requires them expressly to go and disciple all nations;" or, as Mark has it, who wrote for the Gentiles, "Go ye into all the world, and preach my Gospel to every creature."

The universality of this commission, and so of the ministry itself, is brought out very strikingly in our Lord's conversation with the disciples just before His ascension to heaven. They asked Him, saying, "Lord, wilt Thou at this time restore again the kingdom to Israel?" To this inquiry He refused to give them a direct answer, but assured them that they should receive power after that the Holy Ghost was come upon them, saying: "Ye shall be witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth." This universality, however, refers not only to all places, nations, and ages, but includes also *all individuals* of every age and condition of life, i. e., "every creature"—both young and old—just as the great commission itself was found to do. It teaches by implication, the membership of CHILDREN, as well as of adults, in the kingdom of Christ.

To substantiate this assertion, let us look, in the first place, at the conduct of our Lord Himself. He positively declares He "came not to destroy the Law and the Prophets, but to fulfil them." The ancient Law, however, not only allowed and provided for, but absolutely *required*, the membership of ALL—both young and old—who came within the circle of its covenant mercies. "I will be a God unto thee and thy seed after thee," was the explicit declaration of our covenant God and Father. Jesus Christ, in strict accordance with this great principle, did, actually and in the most engaging manner, *recognize* the membership of little children in the "kingdom of heaven." As such, He encouraged them to come unto Him, took them up into His arms, laid His hands upon them, and blessed them. The very nature of God's kingdom also requires that it should embrace all and cover thus the entire ground of our social human life from the cradle to the grave. So broad and comprehensive is the covenant of God in Christ. It excludes no man absolutely, and no part either of any

man's life. And it is equally as firm and abiding as it is comprehensive and broad—"in all things well ordered and sure." In His interview with Zaccheus, our Lord said: "This day is salvation come to this house"—FAMILY. Why to the *family* of Zaccheus?—"because he also is a son of Abraham," and therefore sacred to God "with all his house." This idea of infant membership comes out still more fully in Christ's interview with the Apostles after His resurrection, when He said unto Peter: "FEED MY LAMBS." No wonder, then, that the commission should so run as to include "all nations" and "every creature."

Did the Apostles so understand it? Most assuredly they did! In the very first sermon preached by Peter, at Jerusalem, after having received "power from on high," He had occasion to insist on this truth, and to base upon it an exhortation to repentance "in the name of Jesus Christ," with an assurance of pardon and of the "gift of the Holy Ghost," saying: "The promise is unto you, and to your children"—the Jews and their offspring, "and to all that are afar off"—the Gentiles and their seed. So also, on the occasion of his first sermon among the Gentiles, in the house of Cornelius, the Apostle gathered into the fold of Christ an entire family—parents, children, servants; all, it would seem—presenting thus an epitome of the Church universal, as Taylor observes. So the apostle Paul, with like views of the great commission, introduced into the Church of Christ entire families—such as that of Crispus—of Lydia—of the Philippian Jailor—of Stephanas, and others! The same fact also appears in the writings of John, "the disciple whom Jesus loved"—where he addresses, as members of the Church, the "little children," as well as "young men" and "fathers." From him, as the last of the Apostles and most beloved of all, descended to the primitive Church the universal practice of treating as members the tender lambs of the flock, because they were baptized into the "FAITH," and bare about in their body the dying of the Lord Jesus."

From what has now been said, it will not be difficult to

see what course ought to be pursued in reference to this matter. Our own firm conviction is that not a more important duty rests upon the ministry than that of first "discipling" these "little ones" of the flock, and then taking proper care of them. "FEED MY LAMBS," says Christ; and who will dare to neglect this solemn charge? Whenever the infant members of the family are given over to the world, the hope of pastors is gone, and little or nothing can be accomplished for the cause or kingdom of Christ. The first impressions are always the deepest and most abiding. A neglect in infancy affects the whole life; and yet this subject is but lightly esteemed by many—by some basely despised. Quite different is the spirit that breathes in the ancient fathers of the Church. They felt the extent and force of their commission, as ministers of Christ, and acted accordingly. Irenæus tells us that "Jesus became an infant, to sanctify infants—a child, to sanctify the age of childhood—a youth, to become an example to the young—a man, to redeem men." He passed successively through all these different stages of human life that He might save all. Our duty is to follow Christ—to imitate His excellent example—to embrace with a loving heart, and treat, as heirs with us of the "grace of life," both young and old—to welcome the tender infants of the Church, as well as the middle-aged, and the hoary-headed sires venerable for the multitude of their days, and crowned with a diadem of glory!

The meaning, force, and extent of the apostolic commission is evidently nothing less than this. It contemplates the redemption of ALL. Hence, also, we are to receive into the school of Christ, among others the tender lambs of the flock; and our Lord teaches, in the most explicit terms,

4. *That this introduction into the school of Christ, or "discipling of all nations," is to be accomplished by baptism in "the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."*

Go ye, therefore, and teach—disciple—all nations, baptizing them. Baptism is the divinely appointed means of initiation into the kingdom of God. Paul tells us that we

are saved "by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." This is in perfect accordance with the saying of Christ Himself: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." In the time of Christ and his apostles no *other* way of becoming members of the Church and heirs of life was ever imagined; nor was any one ever regarded as a *disciple* who stood aloof from the covenant and Church of God. Church-membership and salvation were always and inseparably connected in the minds of the apostles and their Lord. "If any man will be my disciple," says Christ, "let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me." And we may easily see what is implied in this self-denial and assumption of the cross; for Christ says: "whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him will the Son of Man also be ashamed, when He shall come in His own glory, and in His Father's and of the holy angels." "He that is not with me, is against me"—"whosoever, therefore, shall confess me before men, him will I also confess before my Father which is in Heaven; but whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in Heaven." To confess Christ is to be baptized into His death, and follow His blessed example; to deny Him, is to refuse submission to the order of grace.

The necessity of baptism, as the means of entering into the kingdom of Heaven, is as we have seen, thus expressed by our Lord: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." On this principle He always acted in gathering disciples unto Himself. Baptism is the "sign and seal" of the New Covenant, the door of admission to the Church, and the *only* divine and sure pledge of pardon and eternal life. In Luke (7: 29–30,) we have this remarkable saying of our Lord: "And all the people that heard him, and the publicans, justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John; but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him." According to this passage,

baptism, or rather we should say a cheerful submission to baptism, was a justifying of God—a recognition of His authority—a sanctioning of His plan of mercy; whilst a refusal to be baptized was virtually a rejection of God's counsel and of all the manifold blessings offered in the covenant, whose "sign and seal" it was! Thus much is clearly implied; and, that baptism looked to something better and more enduring than a mere formal connection with the kingdom of God, and a *bare sign* of its tendered blessings, is clear from the fact that even John's baptism was "for the remission of sins"—the first and most fundamental blessing included in, and guarantied by, the covenant of grace. It brought the subjects of it into a saving relation to God, and sealed to them "the sure mercies of David." No wonder, then, that Jesus commissioned His apostles and their successors in office, to go "and make disciples of all nations, by baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Let us see how the Apostles understood this part of their commission. Did they follow the instructions of their Lord in the sense now given? If so, it will fully establish the correctness of our view. During our Saviour's life and personal ministry, they, as His representatives, did make disciples—many disciples—by *baptizing* them, as appears from the gospel of John (4 : 1, 2), where it is said, that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John; though Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples." This was prior to the Saviour's death and resurrection. But we must look for illustrations of the *nature* and *import* of their commission, as interpreted by them, subsequent to its being delivered to the Apostles. At the close of Peter's Pentecostal sermon, some anxiously inquired: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter answered: "Repent, and be baptized *every one of you*, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost"—the special token of God's covenant mercy—"for the promise is unto you and to your children, and to them which are afar off, even as many as

the Lord our God shall call." Who were these?—"Elders" —"children"—"sucklings" (Joel 2: 16); and how shall they come to the "remission of sins," and a participation in "the gift of the Holy Ghost?"—Through union with the Church, by *baptism* in the name of Jesus Christ. He exhorted the penitent Jews to save themselves from the doom of the unbelieving multitude. "Then they, that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls." On the same ground did Paul—the *penitent*—proceed and become "obedient unto the faith," when exhorted by Ananias to arise and be "baptized" and "wash away" his sins, "calling on the name of the Lord." He himself also baptized individuals and entire families, whom he thus introduced into the covenant of God—calling baptism "the washing of regeneration," by means of which, in connection with "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," we are "saved." Peter compares it to the salvation by water in the days of Noah—"the like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us." And John speaks of an "unction from the Holy one," with evident allusion to the grace of baptism—an unction or "anointing" in the light and power of which the disciples were to "know all things." This anointing or christening "abideth" in the saints as an enduring under-current and basis of eternal life—it being the "*earnest of the Spirit*," or the "sealing with that Holy Spirit of promise," of which Paul speaks, and not to "grieve" which he so earnestly exhorts believers!

Here then is the Scriptural view of baptism and its relation to human redemption. Of the covenant of grace it is the divinely appointed sign and seal—the ordinance by means of which our filial relation to God is permanently sealed, and we are introduced into the Church and kingdom of Christ—receiving that "Spirit of adoption," by which we cry: "Abba, Father"—by which also we are "sealed unto the day of redemption." Such is evidently the order of grace; "for ye are ALL the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," says the Apostle, "for as many of

you as have been *baptized into Christ*, have put on Christ." It becomes us, therefore, earnestly to insist on the importance of baptism—its necessity to Christian discipleship and to a participation in the Church and covenant of God, outside of which there is ordinarily no salvation. Especially ought pastors to solemnly urge upon Christian parents the duty of bringing their children to the baptismal font, there to consecrate them wholly and believingly to God, as the only safe and divinely authorized way to pardon, peace, and eternal life!

The eminent position, which baptism occupies in the order of grace, would seem to require a corresponding system of religious training afterwards; and accordingly the terms of the great commission teach,

5. *That those, who have been thus initiated into the kingdom of God, should be carefully instructed in the doctrines and precepts of the Gospel of Christ.*

"Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The construction shows that "teaching" is a continuation of "baptizing"—inseparably joined to it, and necessary to complete the full idea of discipleship. Baptism takes the penitent and their children, and conducts them into the sanctuary; teaching continues the process of their incipient salvation. Sacraments and the word—the Gospel in act and in speech—go together. The new order of life, whose foundation is laid in baptism, is taken up, continued, and consummated by instruction—in connection, of course, with the Holy Supper, prayer, and the other means appointed for this purpose. The disciple—made such by the sacramental act—is perfected by the Gospel, as read, or taught, or preached—"being born again by the word of God which liveth and abideth forever." We are thus the children of God in a double sense—by the gospel of His grace, as well as by the sacramental act. The word of God runs, like a golden thread, through the entire process of which we are brought to God, and *so* to eternal life! "Of His own will *begat* He us, by the word of truth." By the truth we are "sanctified" also, and so

prepared for the kingdom of glory. Word and sacrament must never be disjoined. They go together, and complete each other, "Even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it *with the washing of water by the word.*"

The very idea of discipleship implies instruction, since disciples are nothing else than *learners*—scholars and pupils in the school of Christ. Already previous to their introduction into the Church and covenant of God, and in fact preparatory to this step, men are in a general way instructed—the terms of the Gospel being by public preaching or otherwise announced to them; but especially after their connection with the Church, as baptized ones or "believers," are they to be carefully instructed, not any longer as "strangers or foreigners," but as fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God"—as children of the covenant. (Eph. 2: 19.) In short, we need a regular system of catechisation, to carry forward with complete success the work of redemption. If the truth is to make us free, then the truth must be made known, and that in the simplest and most impressive form, and in a way adapted to all classes of learners—especially to the young and inexperienced!

Such is the ancient and venerable system of catechisation, so warmly cherished and so generally in vogue in the German Reformed Church. This excellent custom has in fact prevailed from the earliest period of the Church's history down to the present day. It was expressly enjoined, as we conceive, by the Lord Himself, in His great commission, and previously sanctioned by His own personal example. The instruction of the young was warmly inculcated in the ancient law, and was attended to both publicly and in private. That this custom prevailed very generally in the time of Christ, there can be no doubt. Paul characterizes a "Jew," as one who knows God's will, "having been instructed (catechised) out of the law." (Rom. 2: 18.) Apollos was "mighty in the Scriptures," because as a Jew, he had "been instructed (catechised) in the way of the

Lord." (Acts 18: 25.) But what is infinitely better and more clearly confirmatory of this view, is, that Christ Himself, in His infancy and youth, submitted to a course of catechisation, according to the universal custom of the times. This part of our Saviour's history is highly interesting and instructive. In His early infancy, He was circumcised and thus introduced into the Church and covenant of God. Here was a good basis; for, it is said, "the child grew and waxed strong in spirit; filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon Him." (Luke 2: 39, 40.) Then, "when the child was twelve years old," His parents, according to their custom, "went up to Jerusalem," and, as appears from the history, took along with them the child Jesus. This circumstance the Holy Ghost thought worthy of being recorded. Why was he taken along! No doubt for the purpose of having Him still further instructed, or examined rather, by the Jewish doctors previous to His being taken into full communion with the Church, and thus, instead of being simply a "*child of the covenant*" constituted a "member of the congregation of Israel." This took place, it would seem, at the age of thirteen, or rather at the *first* opportunity which presented itself *after the completion of the twelfth year*, according to the doctrine of the Jewish Rabbis. This marks a new epoch. "And Jesus increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." (Luke 2: 52.)

The divine authority, propriety, and excellence of this custom appears from the fact, that Jesus Himself sanctioned it by His own example, that He practised it in reference to His chosen disciples, (Matth. 13: 11) and, that He incorporated it into His own more perfect system. Hence also in this great commission, He solemnly enjoins it upon the Apostles to make disciples of all nations," by "baptizing them to observe all things" whatsoever He had "commanded them."

And how did the Apostles understand this item in their commission? Undoubtedly they felt the force of the sol-

emn requisition. In regard to one of them, at least, we learn that he "taught publicly and from house to house," and that by "teaching every man and warning every man," he sought to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." He earnestly desired that the saints might be "rooted and grounded in Christ, and established in the faith," even as they had been "taught." In regard to this point, we may presume, they were all of one mind; since the *truth* should make men free, and fit them for the service of Christ. In order to facilitate the instruction of the young and inexperienced, they early composed a system of doctrine, which is entitled the "FAITH"—"form of sound words"—"faith of God's elect"—also "the faith once delivered to the saints." This system of doctrine was substantially that of the Apostles Creed, as appears from Paul's representation (Eph. 4: 1–6) where we have a full and complete skeleton of the apostolic symbol, only in the reverse order. So in the Gospels. Luke expressly informs us that he composed his Gospel in order to aid catechumens in attaining unto an assurance in the faith (1: 1–4) "that they might know the certainty (historic basis) of those things wherein they had been instructed"—catechized as in the Greek. Paul urges the Galatian brethren to be kind to their pastors, on the ground of having been "taught"—catechized—by them in the word (Gal. 6: 6); and all the saints he exhorts to be established in the *faith*, even as they had "been taught." (Col. 2: 7.)

The duty and importance of special religious instruction, as enjoined in the apostolic commission, have always been acknowledged and acted upon in the Church. In primitive times there were persons chosen, whose chief duty seems to have been to catechise or give instruction to the young and inexperienced: hence they were called *catechists*. In connection with these primary instructions arose also the custom of giving more full and thorough instruction to such as were designed for higher and more prominent stations in the Church. These schools, in process of time, became regular Theological Seminaries for the training of

ministers. At the time of the Reformation the practice of giving thorough religious instruction was again greatly revived, and an extraordinary interest manifested in the subject. All the Reformers composed practical Treatises on Christian doctrine and practice. Then Catechisms were used by the whole Church. In Germany, in France, in Switzerland, in England and Scotland, everywhere the children and youth of the Church were carefully instructed in all that pertained to vital Christianity. The Reformers all participated in the noble work of getting up suitable books of instruction; and in the subsequent history of the Church, both Catholic and Protestant, we find the same earnest interest manifested. On the one hand, we have the Catechism of the Council of Trent, Catechismus Romanus, and a host of smaller works; on the other side, we have Luther's smaller and larger Catechisms, the inimitable Heidelberg Catechism, the Westminster Confession, with the larger and smaller Catechisms of the Dissenters, and the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England. All these works show what an extraordinary interest this subject once excited; but, alas, these palmy days of the Church, and of Protestantism in particular, are past! People imagine they know too much already without any special religious instruction, and the venerable custom of our fathers is looked upon, by many, as a miserable superstition! Not so with the ancients. They remembered the words of the Apostle: "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine." The good things, which they themselves had "heard among many witnesses," were diligently committed to faithful men who should be "able to teach others also"—well knowing that only under such faithful instructions could "the man of God become perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

Such religious training or catechisation of the young is an all-important branch of pastoral labor. "Feed my sheep"—"feed my lambs," says Christ. This is a blessed duty; but just as difficult as it is blessed. Hence the terms of the commission assure us,

6. *That, in order to encourage His Apostles and their successors in the accomplishment of their great and glorious work, the Lord Jesus pledges them His gracious presence, saying: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."*

This promised presence of Christ with His Church, is personal, constant, and sure to the end of time. The necessity of all this will become apparent as we proceed. The ministerial work is in its own nature already of infinite importance and solemnity; and this solemnity is greatly enhanced by the difficulties which constantly attend the execution of the work and the faithful performance of the several duties involved in the ministry. Our blessed Lord Himself, who was "wise as a serpent and harmless as a dove," speaking as "never man spake," found the greatest difficulty in executing the work which was given Him to do. Opposition and the contradiction of sinners attended His entire ministry on earth. However deep an impression His life, labors, and preaching may, at times, have produced; yet, when the excitement of the moment was over, and the general current of public opinion again obtained the ascendency, these favorable impressions were all lost amidst the fury of popular prejudice and fleshly conceits. Even the Divine majesty of the Son of God and His wonderful miracles could not always subdue the violence of the people!

The Saviour very well knew what difficulties the Apostles and their successors would have to encounter. He said: "Behold, I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves." And again: "If they have called the Master Beelzebub, much more the disciples." He found it necessary indeed to keep up their spirits by saying: "Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely for my sake: rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven." Their lot should be to receive hatred for love, persecution for kindness, and death for their message of life. To encourage and sustain the Apostles in the prospect of such ill-treatment, and to assure them of success in

their arduous undertaking, the Lord attached to His great commission the blessed promise: "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Be not afraid, He would say, nor discouraged by the difficulties and dangers attending your work; for, behold, "I am with you alway." Christ's general omnipresence, as "Son of God," is not the presence spoken of here; although that would already be a great comfort and sure pledge of protection and safety to them. The presence is that of Christ in His mediatorial character; not a bodily or visible presence; for, in this respect, "He is not now on earth, but in heaven, at the right hand of God." The Saviour is present with His Church, as our excellent symbol assures us, according to "His godhead, majesty, grace, and spirit," and that so *really and truly* that every excellence in the Christian character is wrought by Him. It must be so: "for without me ye can do nothing," says Christ; "but he that abideth in me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit." This holds true of all Christians, but pre-eminently so of ministers of the Gospel. Paul says: "Our sufficiency is of God." It is an ample sufficiency according to John—a sufficiency of universal force and application. "For whatsoever is born of God, overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God." This victorious faith entwines itself around the person of Jesus—the Son of God. Hence Paul says: "I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me;" and, therefore, he feels impelled rather to glory in his infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon him.

This presence of Christ, as already said, is a personal one. "Lo, *I* am with you." It is Jesus Christ Himself in all the fulness of His grace and power. So everywhere. His special, peculiar, and precious presence is promised to those who are "assembled in His name." In Zion, now as formerly, He constantly abides. "In Salem is His dwelling-place." This presence is not only for pastors, but measur-

ably also for the whole Church. He is present with the assembly of His saints. All that seek retirement, spiritual communion, and divine assurances in the sanctuary, will find the Redeemer present there. Silently and unobserved He walks amidst the "golden candlesticks," mercifully "holding in His right hand the seven stars," which are the "angels of the seven churches." When assembled for worship, or celebrating the mysteries of redemption, He stands in the midst of His people, saying: "*Peace be unto you.*" And should there be in that worshipping assembly an unbelieving Thomas, who requires some sensible demonstration of the heavenly vision, Jesus mercifully condescends to afford him the desired evidence. "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands, and reach hither thy hand and thrust it into my side; and be not faithless, but believing." Such were the Saviour's words to one of His Apostles; and so He still speaks to His servants, only in a higher and holier, and more comforting sense; and, under an overwhelming sense of such a presence, and moved by an address so affecting and kind, many a heart believes and many a mouth makes confession in the burning words of the disciple: "My Lord and my God."

God is no longer at a distance. In consequence of His incarnation, in the person of His Son, He is "Emmanuel"—God with us—God in our nature permanently at home; and, as such, dwelling in the midst of His people. "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."

This presence of Christ, with His Church, may also be called *constant*, as distinguished from the occasional manifestations of God unto His ancient people—the Jews. To the patriarchs and prophets the Divine Logos—the Son of God—often appeared, and made known to them, in visions, the counsels of the Most High. He tarried with them a little while, and then again reascended His "native heaven." He was with them as a "pilgrim" with "pilgrims." Not so now. The Son of God is also the Son of Man. He has become one of us—Emmanuel. Hence really and in the deepest sense, "the tabernacle of God is with men." The

incarnate Saviour is never absent from His Church, and the ancient promise is fully realized: "My presence shall go with thee." The angel of the everlasting covenant accompanies the Israel of God, in a "pillar of cloud by day and a pillar of fire by night." Jehovah is with His people. The blessed "SHEKINAH" that once stood in mystic glory over the mercy-seat, in the Tabernacle and the Temple, is now permanently enshrined in our nature, and dwells among us in a real, substantial way. "The word was made flesh," says John, "and dwelt among us, and we beheld His *glory*, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and of truth."

Lastly this presence of Christ is a *permanent* one "always sure to the end of time." Not only constant and unvarying, but also abiding or permanent—*absolutely* permanent is the Redeemer's presence—like His person, "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." In all ages of the Church has this presence been felt as a divine force, binding, like a golden cord, the members of Christ's mystical body together, and giving efficacy and success to the labor of His servants. The triumphs of the Church are all attributable to Him "who is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of His person." He, the only begotten Son of God, is still present in the "tents of Jacob." He yet "dwells in the midst of Jerusalem," and "walks about Zion." When the Redeemer says: "Lo, I am with you you alway, even unto the end of the word," the promise is to be regarded as pre-eminently belonging to His holy apostles and their successors, and designed to sustain and comfort them, and give success to their ministry. By the power of His Spirit He strengthens, supports, and inspires with ever-increasing zeal and energy the heralds of the cross. He daily performs His miracles of mercy in connection with their labors. In His grace, therefore, and in His promised presence, let the ministers of Christ confide; and, so confiding, victory over sin and hell, and the songs of triumph will be certain!

D. Y. H.

Bethlehem, Pa.

ART. III.—ALEXANDER ON MARK.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MARK, EXPLAINED BY JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER. New York: Charles Scribner. 1858. pp. 444.

WE understand this to be one of a series of commentaries upon the historical books of the New Testament, which Dr. Alexander is furnishing, while Dr. Hodge is engaged in the same way upon the didactic books; thus promising in time a complete commentary on the New Testament from one of the most learned and eminent theological faculties of our country in the spirit of the Calvinistic theology. Dr. Alexander has already published on the book of Acts; beginning at the end of the New Testament Pentateuch, probably for no reason but that of his own convenience. It seems from his preface to this volume not so much accidental, that, of the four Gospels, he has taken up that of Mark first. This would seem in part a sort of reaction against the disposition, heretofore prevalent even in the most orthodox circles, to depreciate the Second Gospel, and "treat it as a mere abridgement, supplement, or compilation, without any independent character or value of its own;" and to be due also to the conviction, that "there is something in its structure, which makes it eminently fit to give the first impression of the Gospel History, and prepare the reader for the study of the other books."

In the Introduction, which is in this view an interesting and noticeable part of the volume, the author discusses briefly—we may say too briefly—the question of the relation of the Gospel of Mark to the others, and with it of course the relation of all the Gospels among themselves. This might appear at first a very simple question. The ordinary reader of the Bible, whose familiarity with the sacred volume has prevented his reflection upon its struc-

ture, takes this and other of its peculiarities as matters of fact and matters of course. Yet the fact of these four Gospels *is* remarkable; very remarkable; without parallel in the history of literature. There have often been, it is true, various biographies of one prominent person, by different hands, presenting the subject in different lights; but each offering itself to the public as complete. These four Gospels also probably were each offered by its author as complete, and each *is* complete in itself, and makes a definite impression as a biography of Christ. But here they are, not pursuing each its own way with the public and standing for itself; nor accidentally thrown together in a sort of miscellany; but placed side by side as integral parts of one book, as with a purpose, and that the purpose of one author. Certainly a notable phenomenon. No doubt the true theory of it is that stated in the most general way by Dr. Alexander: "That the four Gospels were intended to present the life and character of Christ in four harmonious but distinguishable aspects, each adapted to produce its own impression independent of the others, yet all reciprocally necessary to secure the aggregate effect to be wrought by this part of the sacred history" (p. 9). As to the nature or residence of this "intention," however, the author does not particularly speak; nor does he advance to the next question, "Why there are four Gospels, and only four; or, What are these four harmonious but distinguishable aspects? What is the peculiar impression aimed at by each Gospel, or the particular point of view, from which each is composed? Why, after all, would not one comprehensive Gospel have answered every purpose? A question surely as legitimate as the first, and necessary to it. "The fourfold form of the Gospel History is a lawful and interesting subject of inquiry, as to its specific purpose, over and above the ultimate solution, of which all such questions are susceptible, by simple reference to the will of God. The question is not whether God so willed it, which is absolutely certain, but whether he willed it for a definite reason, either partially or wholly ascertainable

by us, and if so, not without effect upon our methods of interpretation." (p. 7.)

In this more specific form the question in hand is one of deep and wide interest; especially in its connections with the great conception of a unity of life throughout the history, as well as among all the branches of the Church;—a conception, which, now that it has been fairly reached by the theological mind, can never be given up, but must become more and more the basis of all true views of the course of things in the world. The best solution thus far suggested for the problem of the fourfold Gospel, is the view of Neander, Olshausen, Schaff, and other recent interpreters and Church historians, which refers to different "tendencies" of the religious and theological mind at the time, resulting from the great antithesis of Judaism and heathenism. These tendencies or types of thought, were in the nature of the case, just four in number; (1) a more strict or logical Jewish form of Christian thought; (2) a more liberal or intuitive form of the same; (3) a general historical and scientific Gentile conception of Christ and his works, and (4) a contemplative and mystical view from the same Gentile position. These tendencies are very distinctly represented respectively by the four leading apostles, James, Peter, Paul, and John. In point of fact, the four Gospels in their existing canonical order, exactly follow the order of these gradations. Matthew writes with constant reference to the Scriptures, and presents the Messiah of the Jews. Mark writes, according to a well-known and credited tradition, under the influence of Peter, and is absorbed with the actual appearance of the Lord as the Christ of God, according to the Jewish conceptions, but less concerned with its conformity to the Scriptures, than with its present intrinsic interest and joyfulness and its promise of blessing. Luke, under the influence of Paul, presents a general historical conception of Christ, and so brings in that side of his history, which was turned towards the world, instead of confining himself to that, which looked towards Judaism. John forgets all these distinctions

in a profound spiritual view of the Lord, which lies underneath them all. May we not say, that each Gospel's treatment of the genealogical element of the biography of Jesus forms the stamp of its peculiarity in this point of view? It is certainly characteristic, that Matthew gives the lineage of Christ from Abraham; Mark neglects it entirely; Luke gives it from Adam, and John traces it from eternity into time.

Whatever may be the thought of this particular theory, something of the kind is needed to answer the question, which Dr. Alexander himself opens, and even to support the part of the answer, which he himself gives. And we may fairly presume, that something of the kind *must* be true. On the principle here involved the true explanation of the quadruplicity of the Gospel is to be framed. For this theory at once furnishes the conditions of totality in the quadruplicity—showing why the "four aspects" present the complete view of Christ in his advent—and gives the human agency its due share in the arrangement and organism of the four Gospels, as in the original production of each. The true idea of inspiration in general, and of divine supervision in the organization of the inspired books as a whole, must involve that of an *organic* union and coöperation of the divine Spirit with the human nature. The person of Christ, where the organic union of the two natures is exemplified in perfection, is the key to the true theory of inspiration, as it is to the whole relation of God to the world.

This view allows a certain truth even to the idea, which naturally comes first to the reader, that the fourfold form of the Gospel is accidental: in other words, that there was no conscious design on the part of the several authors to produce mutually complemental books. We need not even suppose—what, however, is quite supposable,—that St. John was moved to contribute his peculiar exhibition of Christ by a survey of what had already been written and a sense of the remaining want. So far as the subjective purposes of the authors are concerned, the several Gospels

may, and doubtless should, be supposed to have been perfectly independent in the composition. To suppose in Matthew a conscious design to represent the strict Jewish-Christian tendency in his view of Christ, if it were not absurd, would seriously weaken our impression of the correctness, with which his mind reflected that tendency. To be true to the objective reality, the representative mind must be undisturbed by any subjective *purpose* to *be* representative. That, which is done unconsciously, is the true expression of the age or the prevailing mode of thought, as it is of the individual character. We may properly put a purpose into the mind of the writer, as a help to ourselves in conceiving the objective purpose of the Spirit working in that mind; but this should be *understood*, not as exposition, but as what we may call an *im*position quite legitimate in its place.

The thought of this general human agency, or these divine-human agencies, so *informed* with the Spirit of God, as to have a profound unity of design and of operation under all the apparent diversity, is not only delightful in itself, but fundamental in Christian theology. It is, essentially, that *mystical* element, which must enter into all sound theology and anthropology, as a sort of protest of the heart against the cold rigidity of logic, which can never bring God and man together, and which, in its reasonings from metaphysical pre-conceptions of either, however true to itself, and *because* true to itself, must ever be false to the reality.

The lack of this mystical vein might be mentioned, indeed, as a general criticism on this commentary. A defect, not by any means peculiar to this volume, but belonging to the whole school of theological thought, which it represents. It embarrasses, for example, the treatment of all incidents, which bring to view the twofold nature of the person of Christ. Where Jesus, for instance, is said to have "loved" the self-righteous young ruler, it occurs at once to take this "love" as a natural affection springing in the bosom of the Saviour by virtue of his divine-*human*

constitution; an emotion of sympathy stirred by the evident ingenuousness and earnestness of the young man. Why should that "touch of nature" in this beautiful incident be forbidden by the overshadowing element of divinity, with a "sovereign and gratuitous compassion, such as leads to every act of mercy on God's part (p. 280); any more than when Jesus weeps at the grave of Lazarus? Here is a lurking defect in the conception of the person of Christ; arising really from an excess of metaphysical precision; a failure to reach and retain the idea of an organic, mystical union of the two natures in one person, a union, which makes every act the act of the whole person, of the divine-human person as such, not in any case of one nature or the other by itself. The whole earthly life of Jesus was a divine-human life; nor at any time divine alone, nor at any time human alone; and so is his life in eternity; and his redeeming work is a divine-human work from beginning to end. There is no separating the two natures in the acting, any more than in the constitution of his person. He is ever one Christ. On Jesus' wondering at the unbelief of the Nazarenes (p. 146), Dr. A. well says; "To reconcile omniscience with surprise is no part of our privilege or duty. All such seeming contradictions are parts of the great mystery of godliness, God manifsst in the flesh, the union of humanity and deity in one theanthropic person. However incomprehensible to our finite faculties may be the coëxistence in one person of the divine logos and a human soul, the possession of the latter, if conceded, carries with it all the attributes and acts of which a perfect human soul is capable;" and that, we may add, as attributes and acts, not of the human nature merely, but of the whole theanthropic person. But when the author proceeds: "While to Christ's divinity or eternal spirit there could be nothing new or strange, to his humanity surprise and wonder were familiar,"—he betrays an effort after a rational "comprehension" of the "mystery," false to the proper mental posture, which would express itself in the words just before quoted, and rest in them.

But we do not propose a lengthened discussion of this volume. It is not offered as a learned commentary, like the same author's large work on Isaiah. It evidently aims rather to meet the capacities of the general intelligent reader of the Scriptures. An under-current of thorough scholarship and fresh, independent thought of course runs through it, and it is plainly no mere by-work of the author. Indeed this makes our disappointment the greater, when we find some difficult subjects, such as demoniacal possession, passed over so easily, with an explanation indeed in terms very familiar, such as "*personal*," &c., yet terms, which in such connection call for further discriminating definition. But in general its exegetical analysis is very clear, pursued in a reverent and devout spirit, and leaving the hortatory element, or "practical applications," to be supplied by every reader for himself. Not the least of the merits of this work, as a popular commentary, is the direct and lively narrative style, maintained as a continuous thread throughout the book; preserving to a good extent in the commentary itself the original form and spirit of the Gospel as a connected and complete history. The work is not only a book of reference, but a decidedly readable volume. And we welcome it as a valuable contribution to the standard exegetical literature of our country.

S. N. A.

Art. IV.—THE POWER BEHIND THE THRONE.

The first and highest business and mission of every individual man is to glorify God by his own physical, mental, and moral elevation—to seek the perfection of his nature, by becoming all that he may become, for himself, for others, and for God.

Whenever any one is found earnest, by endeavoring to attain to this, his course commends itself to all men, and is openly praised as noble by the good, and silently acknowledged as such even by those who have not the will and the courage to attempt it for themselves.

It is pleasant to see even a seed that is planted unfolding itself to the full extent of its native capacity in the symmetrical plant and the perfected fruit; on the other hand, it is pitiful and painful to behold it enfeebled in the germ, pining in its growth, and falling short of its fruit. There is something in us which instinctively says: "Well, and bravely done," when in anything—be it plant, insect, bird, beast, or man—we behold all its possibilities becoming actualities.

In man, the highest, this endeavor is the noblest, and its success the grandest. Would it not be strange were such an end reached without care and conflict. Even a grain of wheat, in unfolding the possibilities that are in it, maintains the siege against the drought, the wet, the frost, the fly, the weevil, the rust, the hail—and only when it has kept the field against all these successive phalanxes of enemies lying in wait, and rushing upon it, does it present its golden ear to the joy of the reaper.

The hindrances to our development are yet more and greater. To overcome them is greater than to take a city. To know how to accomplish this is the highest knowledge; actually to attain it is the highest victory; to fall short of it is the most deplorable of failures.

What is the source or power by which individual man is, and may be elevated, so as to become what it is possible for him to be? We have been careful not to say, "How does he elevate himself?" because it is our design to show that his elevation requires a power beyond and around himself —that he needs a backing and support to his individual purposes and endeavors—a power underlying and surrounding his individual life—in the element and energy of which alone the possibilities that lie in his nature are called forth and actualized. This power—whatever we may, in the course of our present investigation, find it to be—we figuratively call *the power behind the throne*—indicating thereby that a man in the highest earthly position, is not necessarily elevated in that which constitutes the perfection of his individual nature. A Herod on the throne was eaten by worms? He elevated himself, but he was not elevated. Greater than the King, which is an office, is the man, which is a being; and when this being is unfolded to all that it may be, it has attained to what a King can not attain as a King, but only as a man—by a power therefore behind the throne, and greater than it.

Human life, like all life, can only grow toward its full development, when it has its proper soil and surroundings. A seed may include in itself all the possibilities of growth, but they are latent till it is brought into connection with the proper outward conditions of growth—without these it remains forever a seed only. So the capability of excellence lies in every individual being; but it will never be developed unless it is nursed and incited by its proper outward conditions. A grain of wheat in the granary or in the dry sand has no power to put forth; so an individual being has no power to unfold his possibilities of himself, except as backed and moved by powers around, behind, and beneath him. The latent power of will, the energies of mind, on the inmost throne of our being, are as helpless as lungs without air, or as heart without blood, if not themselves vitalized by a power that is not inherent in them. When once a man shall lift himself over the

fence by laying hold of his own boot-straps, then may an individual unfold his own being without external conditions. Every Archimedes must have a fulcrum beyond the world which is to be raised.

Take any number of children, and when they are one month old—let them be of the same capacity—place one in the wigwam of the Indian, one in the cave of the Hottentot, one in the tent of the Arab, one in a peasant's family in Spain, one in some boorish family in America, and one in some refined Christian family, rich or poor—and after twenty years mark the difference between six children once inherently alike!

Does not the soil make the plant? Do not the surroundings—that which lies beyond our individual life—mould us into what we are? Is there not something outside of ourselves on which we are dependent for our individual elevation?

What is this soil? You say at once society. But you have not answered the question. Society makes us what it is itself. You say society; and I ask *what* society? Indian? Hottentot? Spanish? Arab? You say, The highest order of society. Very well—what makes the highest order of society? What is it that works, and has wrought back of society, that makes it what it is, or that will make it what it ought to be? What is it that elevates society? The same power that through it elevates the individual. But what is it?—what is the power behind the throne?

Look for a moment at society in its smallest elementary circle—the Family. Is it not a power of elevation or degradation *according to its kind?* "As is the mother so is the daughter"—as is the family so is the child. Is a child elevated above the moral level of the family to which it belongs, this has been done, not by the family, but by some foreign influence. The family itself plainly can furnish no power of elevation above its own level. Families differ; and they do so, because one is elevated above the other by a power behind it. Then the same question recurs, and is unanswered, what is that elevating power?

Take society in a wider circle, as a community. That the individual is silently and powerfully moulded by the bosom of that social life in the midst of which he lives and moves, is most sure. But after its kind and grade; ignorance nurses ignorance—vice begets vice; so intelligence begets intelligence, and virtue cultivates virtue. But why does society here remain as it is—why there does it sink—and there rise? What makes society good? What is the vitality that energises it to the noble and the pure? It cannot be a power inherent in society itself or it would be in all places alike. It cannot be the result of a longer period of development, for society is as old on the banks of the Ganges, the Euphrates and the Nile, as it is on the Rhine, the Thames, or the Delaware.

Take society in its widest circle as national social life. The spirit of a nation is in its people. It exerts a powerful influence on its social and individual life. But here again, after its kind—as evil as it is evil, and as good as it is good. Nor is the difference of nations explained by the period of time they have had for social development; for some of the oldest are the darkest and most effete. Nor is it to be accounted for by their form of government; the Monarchy and the Republic of Rome alike sustained the most barbarous and corrupt social practices, and are together buried amid the ruins of a civilization that has been outstripped and left far behind by nations whose chiefs they once bound to their chariots. There must be a power deeper, and broader, and more potent than nationalities which makes them what they are. A power literally behind Thrones.

As we cannot find the true source of human elevation in the sphere of social life, but find it retreating behind it, let us look for it in mental cultivation and development. There is a power and a glory in mind. It is born for masteries. The visible and invisible powers of the air, earth, and sea, come at its call, crouch like tamed lions at its feet, and say, "Here are we! Speak for thy servants hear!"

"Knowledge is power." But here the same difficulty meets us. What kind of power is knowledge? Power after its kind. Good or evil according as he is who possesses and wields it. Good as a sword is, to defend the king or to stab him—good in the hand of Washington, bad in the hand of Arnold. Knowledge is one thing in the head of Fenelon and another in that of Voltaire. Knowledge will enable a man to defend the right, and it will enable him to defend the wrong. A polished financier can manage a Bank; he can also manage a defalcation. A genius can engrave the Last Supper, or he can engrave a counterfeit note—he can plate spoons, or he can plate bogus coin—he can preach a sermon to a Christian congregation, filling them with high hopes and holy purposes, or he can harangue a mob, inflaming them for sedition and riot. In short, knowledge is a nose of wax which he who has it, turns into the lane which he himself desires to travel—and whether he is going for man or against him, for God or against Him—heaven-ward or hell-ward, it alike serves His purpose and helps him on! It simply makes him a greater saint or a greater sinner—nothing more.

Something must lie back of knowledge which makes its possession elevating. What is it? Do you say Goodness. Right. But what makes him Good? What is the power behind the throne?

It cannot be knowledge, for we have seen that it is neither good nor bad—and that it is both good and bad according as it is used. If knowledge had power to make men good then all learned men would be good; but they are not. Then all ignorant men would be wicked; but they are not. Knowledge in a man's head has no more power to make him good than money in his pocket has that power. With the money in his pocket he can buy a Bible or a bottle of whiskey; with the knowledge in his head he can bless or curse his race!

Shall we try again, and seek the source of human elevation in the wonderful improvements which characterize our time; by which every power and activity is facilitated

and every capacity multiplied? Here we meet the same difficulty.

Is the press Good? We must ask who is behind it? Whose soul is in it? What sheet is that which drops from it at the rate of one hundred in a minute? The improvement is simply this, that it enables a good man to do good faster, and a bad man to do evil faster.

So it is in regard to steam. Who is behind it? It speeds the pirate ship and the slaver, as well as that of the merchant and missionary. The rail car will bear a man in a few hours to a distant point alike to preach a sermon or to steal a horse! Threshing machines afford the Farmer Boys leisure in the winter to learn science in school, or to learn bad habits out of it.

These are mere particulars referred to, to illustrate the general principle, that all physical, mechanical improvements are related to human elevation and degradation alike —may be made, and are made, to serve the one as well as the other, according to the spirit of him who wields them.

We may at least, in this connection, submit the question whether sharp devices in evil—keen and cunning schemes of rascality—frauds on a superior scale—have not kept full pace with material progress in all other respects? Try it —make two pens, gather the smart rogues into one and the dumb rogues into the other, and see which will contain the largest number. You say perhaps that the inmates of our prisons are generally ignorant criminals. So they are; but the scientific ones never get there! It would affect their standing in society. The well known verse in Gray's Elegy might be altered thus:

> Full many a rogue of rich and scientific mien,
> The dark unfathomed dens of cities bear;
> Full many a scamp slips through the net unseen,
> And breathes polution through the social air.

The same difficulty is met in the problem in relation to the relief of pauperism. To relieve and elevate the suffering poor is a blessed work. But how is it to be done, so as really to elevate them. Not by giving in itself. The

quarter you give will buy bread or liquor, as he may please who receives it. Your gift may relieve distress, and it may encourage idleness. Perhaps one third of those who are fed in our poor-houses in the winter are loafers instead of paupers. They feel encouraged to spend their summers in idleness and profligacy by the very hope of food and shelter which they may sure expect of the county, or at the hands of the generous. Whether giving will prove a good or an evil to the recipient depends on his own character. If such a character as charitable contributions cannot give belongs to the person, your charity is a blessing, if not, it is a curse. Whence is this difference of character? What is it in the poor that sanctifies the gift? What is the power behind the throne, which is the source of all physical, mental, and moral elevation?

It must be something lying back of social life—back of mental cultivation—back of material improvements—back of philanthropic benevolence. What is it? There are two ways in which we may obtain an answer to this important question. By a view of the nature or constitution of man, or that in him which is to be elevated; and then also by looking at the history of the manner in which he has attained his present degree of elevation.

What is man—and what is in him to be elevated? He is a unit; and the whole man must be symmetrically elevated. Though a unit, there are three grades or spheres in his being, as all sound philosophy and common observation teach—body, soul, and spirit. His body is the lowest side of his being, which is formed out of the matter of the material world beneath him, and through which he is allied to it, and dependent on it. His spirit holds a corresponding place on the highest side of his being, and through it he stands related to the world of spirit. His soul is the intermediate intellectual nature, which on the one side is allied to the body and the world of matter through the senses; on the other to the spirit, and the spiritual world through the moral or spiritual faculties. Thus man forms the link between the material and spiritual worlds—belongs

wholly to neither, but alike to both—answering thus to his formation from the earth beneath and the breath of the Almighty from above.

Now it is plain that man can not be elevated by that which looks only to his body,—however important it is to care for it—because, if the higher parts of his nature are bad, his body must and will suffer injury. The will to strong drink, the affections of lust, for instance, which are in the higher, will frustrate all hope of bodily elevation.

It is equally plain that any thing that looks only to his soul or mind can not be successful in elevating him; because there are powers in the higher sphere of his spirit which control all beneath. Thus the will—which is moral—controls the understanding, and reigns over all the intellectual nature. Do you say the will is purely intellectual—then we say no, because we often see that an ignorant man has more will than the most intelligent. The will is over the intellect as its master, and if it is bad it will frustrate all endeavors to elevate the man through his intellect. Do we wish illustrations, take Poe in the gutter; or Byron in his lusts—with all their intellect. Take hundreds of learned men who swim in the vilest dregs!

We must also carefully avoid the idea that the elevation of the lower spheres in man—physical and mental—can come first as stepping stones to the higher. That is the very mistake we would avoid. The elevation of these lower is a result not a cause. The very fact that they are lower, shows that they are under the control of the higher. The reservoir must fill the hydrants. In the loftiest part of our nature must be the throne from which power and law proceed for all beneath. The high sun must first shine before there can be reflections to his light, or responses to his genial warmth, from the worlds which lie beneath him.

We are driven back then to the spirit as the first and highest, and the ruling part in man. As it is, so is his mind and his body. On this summit of man's being must the light first touch, before it can descend to illuminate the regions of his being which lie beneath.

The will, the conscience, the affections—in short, the entire moral nature must be purified and elevated, first of all, or there can be no hope of man's elevation. This must be done by a power lying behind them, and greater than they—the power behind the throne.

We may come still nearer to the answer sought for—and perhaps obtain one full and satisfactory—by looking at the history af human elevation.

The endeavor after human elevation is nothing new. It has been sought after in all ages and in all lands. History must record the varied failure or success. It must be possible from history to ascertain in what nations or ages the highest attainments have been made ; and it must be possible also to trace these differences to their causes—for that which elevates nations must be a power wider and greater than nationalities themselves or the cause would be inadequate to the effect. So that this cause can not be an obscure factor, but must be a great, visible, tangible power. We would respectfully commend this feature of the subject to the earnest consideration of the reader, as in it we must find the true source of civilization.

Only one general fact we would notice. It would seem from a general view of the history of our race that it has been felt in all ages and nations, that the power in which man hopes for the elevation of himself is believed to be in a higher world, with which it is necessary to come into communion through the highest side of our being. Thus what history intimates would correspond with what we have just educed from the nature of man's physical, mental, and moral constitution. Thus our two independent and unbiased witnesses would agree that the power behind the throne is the power of a higher world—the supernatural working in the natural, and energizing it by its high ever-victorious life.

In striving after the needed communion with this ultimate elevating power, three efforts are manifest in history all tending to one point.

All the oriental nations lying eastward from Palestine

believed that this communion could only be effected by the coming down of the gods into our nature, and thus all their gods are incarnations—gods taking the form and nature of man.

All the nations of the occident, lying west from Palestine, believed that it could only be effected by the opposite order, of raising men into the sphere of gods, and thus they had deifications of men—heroes and wise men elevated to gods from whom they now expected help.

Between these two systems, in Palestine, originated another, which professes that in it the wants and endeavors of both are met and fulfilled—in God coming down into the form and nature of man, by which man also is raised into union with God. This system professed to be the light of the world, and the leaven that should silently transform and elevate men and nations. Though humble in origin, and silent in its deepest operations, as all great things are, it proved itself a power behind thrones. It soon gave laws in the Areopagus of the Greeks, and in the Palace of the Roman Caesars. Grecian and Roman civilization fled before it like clouds before the rising sun. It subdued the rough and nervous babarism of the Teutonic hoards of northern Europe and created them into refined and powerful nations. It crossed the channel, calling the rude Britons from the stupor of ages, and clothed a benighted Island with glory as with a garment. It outrode the waves of the Atlantic and created this wonder of the nations in the West. The wilderness and the solitary places were glad for it, and the desert rejoiced and blossomed as the rose.

Certain it is that millions have regarded, and do now regard, this as the power behind all earthly powers. They say, and seemingly at least with great reason, that its history is the history of good government, of arts and sciences in their highest form, of the greatest refinement in family and social life; in short, of peace on earth, and good will to men.

That it has produced mighty convulsions and revolutions

in the history of the world, only proves its deep and leaven like workings. What it has overturned perhaps needed overturning; and ever through the noise and confusion of its conflicts with opposing powers came the sweet voice of peace, the victorious shout of progress, and the joy of a higher freedom.

How He who brought peace brought also a sword—and how behind the struggles of history under the genial power of Christianity, man, society and civilization ever rise to a higher state of moral elevation—and how this power behind all thrones creates the loveliest order out of what seems the most hopeless confusion, may be illustrated by means of a little elastic poem, with which we shall conclude this article.

THE MYSTIC WEAVER.

I

Weaver at his loom is sitting,
Throws his shuttle to and fro;
Foot and treadle,
Hands and pedal,
Upward, downward,
Hither, thither,
How the weaver makes them go!
As the weaver wills they go.
Up and down the web is plying,
And across the woof is flying;
What a rattling,
What a battling,
What a shuffling,
What a scuffling,
As the weaver makes his shuttle,
Hither, thither scud and scuttle.
Threads in single,
Threads in double;
How they mingle,
What a trouble!
Every color—
What profusion;
Every motion
What confusion;

Whilst the web and woof are mingling,
Signal bells above are jingling,
Telling how each figure ranges,
Telling when the color changes,
As the weaver makes his shuttle,
Hither, thither scud and scuttle.

II.

Weaver at his loom is sitting,
Throws his shuttle to and fro;
Mid the noise and wild confusion,
Well the weaver seems to know,
As he makes his shuttle go,
What each motion—
And commotion:
What each fusion—
And confusion,
In the grand result will show—
Weaving daily,
Singing gaily,
As he makes his busy shuttle,
Hither, thither scud and scuttle.

III.

Weaver at his loom is sitting,
Throws his shuttle to and fro;
See you not how shape and order
From the wild confusion grow,
As he makes his shuttle go?
As the web and woof diminish,
Grows beyond the beauteous finish:
Tufted plaidings,
Shapes and shadings,
All the mystery
Now is history:
And we see the reason subtle,
Why the weaver makes his shuttle,
Hither, thither, scud and scuttle.

IV.

See the mystic weaver sitting,
High in heaven—His loom below,
Up and down the treadles go:

Takes for web the world's long ages,
Takes for woof its kings and sages,
Takes the nobles and their pages,
Takes all stations and all stages:
Thrones are bobbins in His shuttle;
Armies make them scud and scuttle—
Web into the woof must flow,
Up and down the nations go,
As the weaver wills they go.
Men are sparring,
Powers are jarring,
Upward, downward,
Hither, thither,
See how strange the nations go,
Just like puppets in a show.
Up and down the web is plying,
And across the woof is flying,
What a rattling,
What a battling
What a shuffling,
What a scuffling.
As the weaver makes his shuttle,
Hither thither scud and scuttle.

V.

Calmly see the mystic weaver,
Throw his shuttle to and fro;
Mid the noise and wild confusion,
Well the weaver seems to know
What each motion
And commotion,
What each fusion
And confusion
In the grand result will show,
As the nations,
Kings and stations,
Upward, downward,
Hither thither,
As in mystic dances go.
In the Present all is mystery,
In the Past 'tis beauteous History.

O'er the mixing and the mingling,
How the signal bells are jingling.
See you not the weaver leaving
Finished work bihind in weaving ?
See you not the reason subtle—
As the web and woof diminish,
Changing into beauteous finish—
Why the weaver makes his shuttle,
Hither, thither scud and scuttle

VI.

Glorious wonder! What a weaving!
To the dull beyond believing—
Such no fabled ages know.
Only faith can see the mystery
How along the aisle of History
Where the feet of sages go—
Loveliest to the purest eyes—
Grand the mystic tapet lies !
Soft and smoothe and even spreading
As if made for angel's treading ;
Tufted circles touching ever,
Inwrought figures fading never ;
Every figure has its plaidings.
Brighter form and softer shadings.
Each illumined—what a riddle !—
From a Cross that gems the middle.
'Tis a saying—some reject it—
That its light is all reflected :
That the tapet's hues are given
By a Sun that shines in Heaven !
'Tis believed, by all believing
That great God Himself is weaving !
Bringing out the world's dark mystery
In the light of faith and History.
And as web and woof diminish
Comes the grand and glorious finish :
When begin the golden ages,
Long foretold by seers and sages.*

Lancaster, Pa. H. H.

*In the light of the truth we have endeavored to unfold in this little poem

ART. V.—WHAT IS POETRY? *

In our college days we enjoyed the rare privilege of attending a course of lectures on Æsthetics by Dr. Rauch, first President of Marshall College, who, whilst he devoted his attention principally to the philosophy of Mind and Morals, demonstrated by these lectures that he was equally at home in the philosophy of Art. The impression which they produced on those who heard them, and on many who heard of them, will not be soon erased. They were, perhaps, the first strictly scientific course of lectures on the philosophy of the Fine Arts ever delivered before an American College. They were, certainly, the means of introducing his students into an entirely new world of ideas, to which, at the time, there was no access in the current English literature. With the desire of assisting in promoting the interest in aesthetical studies, which has been on the increase in this country and England for the last ten or fifteen years, it is proposed in this article to enlarge upon, and to reproduce, in a free way, some of the views advanced by our honored teacher, now no more, on this interesting department of science. In doing so, we are happy in saying that

* Notes of Lectures on Æsthetics by Dr. F. A. Rauch, President of Marshall College. Delivered to the Junior Class, 1841. *In Manuscript.*

Solger's Vorlesungen ueber Aesthetik. Leipzig, 1829.

Algemeine Aesthetik in Akademischen Lehrvorträgen von Friedrich Thiersch. Berlin, 1846. A good Hand Book.

Aesthetik oder Wissenschaft der Schönen, von Dr. Friedrich Theodor Vischer, 1847. This work is in four octavo volumes, and is pronounced by competent judges the best on the subject that has yet made its appearance.

---

we may console ourselves with the thought, that even the dark cloud of war which now hangs over the nations of the old world, is not without its bright "silvery lining," indicating that the light of heaven is shining behind it. Wherever and whatever it may be, there is rubbish somewhere which has been piled up in ignorance or unhallowed ambition by the *human factor* in history which the *divine factor* requires to be removed. The devil may do it, but he works for God. The power behind thrones will break open the channel of History.

any want of distinct recollection on our part respecting what we heard, now eighteen years ago, has in a great measure been provided against by more or less reflection on the general subject, as well as by a careful study of standard German writers, who have treated the science of Æsthetics in the same spirit and stood in the same school with Rauch.

In the present paper we design to take a view of poetry in some of its more general relations, and, if possible, to show something of its nature and mission.

In order to arrive at a proper idea of poetry, or to answer the oft repeated, but seldom answered question, *what is poetry*, it is necessary for us, in the first place, to inquire into the nature and meaning of Art, inasmuch as poetry is one of the Fine Arts, and carries with it the nature of art in general.

It is very common to hear individuals speak of Nature and Art in the way of contrast, or of opposition to each other, as though they were entirely different spheres of life or thought. Thus the hacknied question, which are the most beautiful, the works of nature or art, hinges upon this supposed antithesis, and continues to be debated, without any hope, as it would seem, of a satisfactory solution. The popular view leans decidedly in favor of the works of nature, because, according to the common argument, God is the author of nature, whilst man is the author of art. But is it true that God works only in the natural world, whilst the sphere of art is left to the wisdom and ingenuity of man? We reply that there is nothing less philosophical than such a supposition. It is true that nature is simply the development of the divine will, which penetrates and animates those laws, by which its frame-work is held together. But it is certainly an error to suppose that the divine power breaks off abruptly with the irrational world, and has nothing to do with the productions of human intelligence. The works of art are produced by the free development of the human imagination, but the laws, by which they are evolved, are as much the expression of the

divine will as those that give form to the various productions either of the vegetable or mineral world. The same power, that forms the icicle, the dew-drop, or the rose, reigns as law just as supremely, in the evolution of works of poetry, sculpture or painting. It is true, art is penetrated with human consciousness, whilst nature is not, and this at once elevates it into a higher sphere than that of the blind productions of nature. But this is simply a distinction, and not such a difference as emancipates it from the power of divine and eternal laws. Art stands in nature, and is properly a part of it, but its constant tendency is to rise above and beyond it, by taking up into it its diversified forms, and then refining them and filling them with a clearer and more distinct meaning, until it approaches in the way of type, shadow, or prophecy, the great infinite and eternal Beyond, in which the universe itself finds its truth and significance. As thus related, nature and art form a living unity, and they should not be abstractly sundered. Art without nature, becomes fantastic and meaningless, whilst, on the other hand, nature without art is deprived of her legitimate exponent and is shorn of her beauty.

Art, however, has its proper antithesis, and this it finds in the idea of Science. In order to orient ourselves more fully in regard to the subject before us, it will be of service to us, if we consider somewhat in detail the difference, or as the Germans say, the *Gegensatz*, involved in the case. Science commences with the particular, that is, with single events, facts or phenomena, but only with the view of arriving at the general principles, which animate them, and give them their particular form or subsistence. This remark applies, of course, to science in its rise and progress, and not its consummation; for when its end has been reached, that is, when general laws and principles have been eliminated, the process is reversed, and science, from her imperial throne sways a more than regal sceptre over the realms of facts or phenomena, holds them under her power by the omnipotence of law, and proceeds to extend her dominions

by subjecting new facts and phenomena to her authority. When, however, science thus becomes organized, the particular is lost in the general, and, though individuals may be preserved for the purpose of confirming deductions already made, or of being admired as matters of taste, they possess only a subordinate interest.

Art, on the other hand, takes its rise in the ideal world, and is, first and foremost, exclusively concerned with the general or the universal. The artist has as keen an eye as the philosopher to penetrate the inner nature and truth of things, which he does by a species of inspiration or intuition, and not by the hard study, and tedious experiments of the man of science. But when he has attained to such a vision of the inner soul of things, he is not satisfied, as the mere theorizer would be, nor has he attained to the end of art. He has formed an *ideal*, which exists within him as a germ, involving a power that cannot lie dormant, when the proper conditions for its evolution are at hand. It is still without form and void, but, in accordance with a law of life, that is supreme every where, it seeks to embody itself, and as far as possible to become tangible to the outer senses of man. It exists in the mind, not as an abstraction, but as a living power. *Igneus est ollis vigor et coelestis origo seminibus.* The material for its embodyment, is ever at hand in the external world, in nature, in history, in man, and it is the mission of the artist, guided by a genial imagination and the laws of taste, to shape and transform the rude material until it is best adapted to represent the particular thought or idea, which has been fermenting in his mind. This involves an inward union of thought and form, of the ideal and the real, of the invisible and the visible, and of the infinite and the finite, in a word, a concrete unity unfolding itself in diversity. When this coalescing process is completed, we have a work of art, "a thing of beauty," which is admired by all, not because it is useful, not because it is a means, to some other end, or on account of the skill it displays, but simply because it is beautiful.

Thus it will be perceived that whilst science proceeds

from the particular to the general, and then rests from its labors on the etherial summit which it has reached; art, on the other hand, proceeds from the general to the particular, and when it has succeeded in uniting the two, it rests and enjoys its sabbath also. The philosopher has discovered the *true*, the object of his search; the artist has found the *beautiful*, and this is the end of his labors.

But whilst art and science are thus antipodes, it must not be supposed that they have nothing in common, or that they do not gravitate towards a common centre. This were contrary to all analogy, and to the well established truth, that nothing in the universe can stand in a state of isolation. All spheres of life and activity have a mutual connection, or basis of support. Truth, as already said, is the object and end of all science and philosophy, whilst Beauty is the end of art. But these ideas, the True and the Beautiful, though divergent, are nevertheless in God, their source, one and the same, for He is the absolute Truth and at the same time the absolute Beauty. Beauty, according to Plato, is the reflection of Truth. It is simply the embodiment of truth in the various forms of art, which it animates and through which it emits the mild radiance of its divine original. There are, however, two different methods of representing truth to the contemplation of the mind. In the one case, it is presented under its naked or its abstract form, with as little assistance from the senses as possible. This is the mission of science; in the other case, it appears under concrete and sensible forms in accordance with laws of taste. This is art.

Now as there can be no science where there is no truth as its basis, so there is no art in the sphere of error, falsehood, or deceit. When the artist, accordingly, panders to a corrupt public opinion, attempts to varnish over vice, or to give expression to his subjective lust or infidelity, he has lost his polar star, profaned the name of art, and forfeited his niche in the temple of the muses. His works may enjoy an ephemeral popularity; they may bring money into his pocket, whilst he, Voltaire-like, enjoys for a time

the acclamations of an adoring throng. But when the next wave of human progress makes its appearance, they are swept away and forgotten. Think of the fecundity of ancient art. Its productions are now for the most part buried amid the ruins of the past, as many of them doubtless deserved to be. Yet they have not all of them been overtaken by a like disastrous fate. The works of Homer, of Sophocles, and of Phidias, remain with us, and are still the admiration of the civilized world. It is true they were produced in the midst of heathenism and abounding errors of every kind. But the civilization of the ancient heathen was not a mass of unadulterated error; there were rays of light and truth mingled with their superstition, of which the artist freely availed himself, and by which he was inspired to embody in immortal forms his ideals of truth and beauty. Art, of course, varies its character with the age or the land in which it is produced. Thus we have Egyptian, Grecian, or Assyrian art. We have also a Heathen or Mohammedan art, and under the light of Christianity, we have a Christian art. Its character depends entirely upon the soil in which it grows, and its intrinsic value will vary with the amount of truth which is involved in a given form of civilization. But in the midst of all these variations, there is that which is immutable and eternal. The outward form may lose its value and interest, but the soul, which it enshrines, strikes a sympathetic cord wherever truth finds an adherent or a worshipper. Hence, true Christianity is never hostile to the art of any nation or age, except as it is misapplied or untrue to itself, and the Christian, who stands on the loftiest eminence on the plain of the world's history, admires the works of ancient genius, is himself ennobled by their study, and freely permits them to operate as an element in shaping the general culture of his times.

Thus far we have discussed the nature of art in general, but in these remarks, we have, at the same time, also been discussing the general nature of each particular art. They, however, find a fuller illustration, and a more extensive

application in poetry than in any other of its sister arts, for poetry is the most expressive and the most universal of them all. Architecture, Sculpture, Painting and Music are all more or less circumscribed in their range, and, from their very nature, they can afford only particular glances into the ideal world. This is owing to the character of the material, which, of necessity, they are constrained to use for the expression of ideas, such as marble, color, or sound. Poetry, on the other hand, has no limits of this kind. The "boundless universe is hers." Human speech is the flexible and etherial material, which she shapes for her use, and converts into every possible form of beauty. The word, instinct with life, is the most energetic and universal of all other symbols. Under the wand of genius, it may, like the marble or the canvass, be made to reflect all the images of beauty in nature, or, penetrating the world of consciousness, to depict the feelings and sentiments of the human breast with more life and power than either Painting or Music. Poetry, with this mode of expression, and with such a talisman, takes her flight into still higher regions, whither the other arts never ascend. She expresses *pure thought*, divested of its sensuous covering, and in its most refined form.

If, now we consider poetry as one of the arts, its specific character will be best understood, by distinguishing it from that sphere of activity, to which it sustains a polar relation. Poetry and prose constitute the antagonism. This is so evident, that, as we all know, they are not unfrequently brought into unhappy collision. In the hands of the uninitiated they even make offensive inroads upon each other's provinces, and seriously interfere with each other's particular vocation. It is not seldom the case, that the veriest prose imaginable, dressed up in verse, or jingling with discordant rhyme, is made to pass off as the genuine article of poetry, and the sober facts of prose-life are painted in all the colors of the rainbow, so that the reader, if he is not inclined to be critical, might be led to suppose he was reading the latest attempt at producing a national

epic. As a consequence, we meet with poetic prose or prosy poetry, just as one or the other element predominates. They are incongruities, truly, in the sphere of the arts. They involve a palpable confusion of ideas which are distinct, and, whose boundaries, though contiguous, are nevertheless clearly marked and should be sacredly observed. By this allusion to a rather numerous company at the foot of Parnassus, we of course mean no disparagement to what is sometimes regarded as the humbler taste of writing plain prose. To do the latter successfully, requires art and cultivation of the highest kind. But poetry is a province distinct and has given rise to a different branch of art.

Prose varies in its character. It may be either descriptive, narrative, argumentative or speculative, but in all cases it is simply *reproductive*, and *faithfulness*, to the objective world, which it describes or investigates, is essentially necessary. The historian is expected to narrate events just as they occurred, and is not allowed to omit any of the facts on the one hand, nor on the other, to give too much significance, or too high a coloring to those which he details. He penetrates the meaning of his materials and unfolds the laws of human progress. It is his office to discover what *is*, not to invent, and he is, therefore, no poet or maker. Oratory seeks to persuade and convince, and this is accomplished, when the orator has proved, that a particular case belongs to a general principle, truth or rule. He, as well as the historian, adorns his productions with flowers culled in the garden of poetry, but these are kept in a proper subordinate relation to the ultimate effect, which is to be produced. It is a sad mistake, therefore, in an oration, when it is so constructed, that the audience forget the particular point, which is to be established, and are thrown into an ecstacy of admiration at the gorgeous imagery under which it is concealed. Oratory, like history and science in general, creates nothing; it simply reveals what already has an existence in the natural order of things.

Poetry, on the one hand, is *inventive*, *creative*, *productive*. The poet must have as strict regard for truth as the prose-

writer, but in his representation of it he is not bound by the objective order in which events or phenomena have taken place in the real world. He is perfectly free to select, omit facts, or to create, just as it may best suit his purpose. In this respect he is altogether an eclectic. With poetic instinct, peculiarly his own, he gathers such material as may be necessary for his work, from the broad fields of nature or history, and with plastic power, gives them such a form, as will be best adapted to reflect his thoughts. To Homer it was quite immaterial whether the siege of Troy was what he describes it, or simply a piratical excursion of the early Greeks. With the few facts, handed down by history, he created a siege of his own, which, though it were entirely fictitious, has concentrated, as it were, into one of the focal points of history, the rich heroic life of ancient Greece, and with more effect than the historian, with his materials, could have done. Virgil, following in his footsteps, describes the result of that memorable siege, the Trojan horse, the horrors of burning Troy, with its midnight fires lighting up the neighboring coast. It is, of course, the creation of the poet, but what of that? The whole scene finds its meaning in the virtue and filial piety of his hero Æneas, escaping from the ruins of an old order of things, with his aged father on his shoulders, and carrying with him the paternal gods and the elements of a future magnificent empire in the west.

But again, prose differs from poetry, not only in the fact that, in the one case, the external material is taken exclusively from the real world, whilst, in the other, it is the free product of the imagination. The external and the internal are brought together and united differently. Poetry is older than prose, hence, though its contents may be the same as that of prose, yet the connection between the form and its contents is not the same. In poetry the general and the particular, the law and its phenomenon, are not separated, as they are in prose by critical reflection. They flow together and into each other, so much so, that they form a unity, a single concrete existence. Such is the interpene-

tration of form and contents, of spirit and outward manifestation, that we behold a work of sculpture, or read a poem, without any desire to separate them. This is indeed impossible, as the connection is an organic one, and the poetic spirit will not permit us to do it. What Winkelman, as quoted by Cousin,* says of a master piece of Grecian sculpture, will illustrate what has here been said.— "Of all the antique statues that have escaped the fury of barbarians and the destructive hand of time, the statue of Apollo, is, without contradiction, the most sublime. One would suppose that the artist composed a figure purely ideal, and employed matter only beeause it was necessary for him to execute and represent his idea. Its height is above that of man, and its altitude proclaims the divine grandeur with which it is filled. A perennial spring time, like that which reigns in the happy fields of Elysium, clothes with loveable youth the beautiful body, and shines with sweetness over the noble structure of the limbs." So much for the Apollo Belvidere, but the same language, the terms being changed, may be applied with equal truth to Homer's description of the Grecian god, from whom Phidias most probably derived his ideal.

If now we examine the inner constitution of prose-works, we find ourselves in an entireiy different world. Here the critical judgment has been sadly at work, and analysis has sharply drawn the line of demarkation between the soul and body, the spirit and the letter, between law and phenomenon, between cause and effect, between means and end. The separation has subserved the best interests of man ; it has removed the precious metal from the alloy, in which it is found in its natural state, and therefore involves an advance in human existence ; but the process has been the destruction of all true poetry, as certainly as the dissecting knife in the hand of the anatomist, destroys the beauty that still lingers on the lineaments of the human form, ere its vital powers have left it. The transition from the region of poetry into that of prose, is as great as a passage from a

* Lectures on the True, the Beautiful, and the Good.

champaign country, where perfumed breezes forever sport with shrub and flower, into some gorgeous hall, illuminated with a thousand sparkling lamps, but otherwise filled with innumerable skeletons left behind by the hand of science.

Other points of difference between works of poetry and prose might be pointed out. Differing as they do in their inner spirit, as might be expected, they show the difference in their outer form and structure. Poetry is best embodied in verse or rhyme, and employs a language and a mode of expression, which is peculiarly its own, and readily distinguishable from that of ordinary prose. But upon these external marks of distinction, as well as others, we can not enlarge, inasmuch as these remarks are designed to be general, rather than specific, suggestive and not exhaustive.

Poetry, if considered in its relation to itself, must have as its animating soul something *general*, such as an *action*, a *purpose*, or a *fact*, that has a central significance, with a union in itself and in its different parts or utterances. This generality must not be something separated from the real world; it has nothing about it that is abstract or lifeless, but is in the fullest sense concrete and real, in which the parts that go to coustitute the totality or union, have an internal connection. The scene must be placed somewhere in the human world, for, though Poetry, as the universal art, is not confined to any particular rank of beauty, now soars to the regions of eternal light and lays its garland before the throne of God, now walks the green earth and infuses beauty into the humblest flower, it makes its home with man, and sings a human song, which, if it ascend to Heaven and resounds through Nature, is still made up of human affections, human sympathies and human thoughts. In the Iliad, the wrath of Achilles is the central point, from which is evolved with wonderful velocity, and yet with wonderful ease, the heroic life of Greece, bringing before the reader panoramic views of her social, political, military and religious life, her virtues and her vices, her

glory and her shame. What, in the natural course of events, it required centuries to develope, here in Homer's song is concentrated and developed on the plains of Troy a second time, in less than a period of two months. Critics have not discovered the same unity, nor the same diversity, nor the same completeness of parts in Virgil or Milton, and hence, whatever may be their merits, as it regards beauty or magnificence of diction, and other respects, they fall below Homer in their works as well as in their genius.

All philosophic themes, such as virtue, happiness, honor, or religion, as well as theological dogmas, are not poetic, and to one who possesses true taste, the very announcement of a theme of this description, has a singular effect upon the mind, before the poem itself is read. Our poetic feelings are chilled, the imagination loses its elasticity, and we sit down with our reasoning powers aroused, to grasp a philosophical disquisition or a learned essay. We wish ourselves, however, to be understood. The subjects just named, are not beyond the reach of the muses, for though their realms are infinite, they do not extend their walks into the regions of abstractions, nor commune with airy nothings, that have neither flesh, muscle, vein or artery about them. When these subjects appear in the concrete relations of life and walk as realities under the blue heavens and on the green earth, in the living purpose of man or woman, they are poetic and admit of poetic representation. Then the muse can sing of faith, love, piety, and religion, with more enthusiasm, and quite as much truthfulness, as the moralist or the philosopher can speculate on these sublime subjects. Didactic poetry as such, that is poetry whose professed object is to teach or instruct, of which we have a considerable amount in our English language, so often recommended by those who have the interests of religion and morality at heart, but, doubtless, recommended, not so much because they are works of art, as because they inculcate true views and sentiments, is not pure poetry, or at least not in its higher form. It is either the incipient effort of a nation's muse, endeavoring

to clothe the sayings of its wise men in poetic language, or it is the product of a later age of reflection, of a period of transition, when the poetic life is gradually giving way to a life of sober, earnest prose. Didactic poetry, however, has its place,—and that is when it serves as an accompaniment. In an epic poem or a drama, an actor is expected to give utterance to noble thoughts or purposes, provided he does so without constraint or hypocrisy, and, in such connection, the didactic element is not only in place, but in an eminent degree poetical. There the lesson falls on the human ear like the voice of ancient seer or prophet. The value, and indeed the artistic excellence of a poem, depends on its being so constructed, that it shall give a free expression to the best, the profoundest and holiest thoughts of the human breast, of the age or country. The poems of the Greek tragedians, Æschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, are remarkable for the pure and exalted sentiments which glitter in their classic pages, like gems on the brow of peerless beauty. In this respect they present a favorable contrast by the side of dramas that have been produced under more favorable circumstances. The wisdom, which is thus embodied in the creations of poetry, presents us with examples of the highest beauty—the moral and spiritual. It is a word fitly spoken, like apples of gold in pictures of silver. But it is quite otherwise when didactic poetry separates itself from the drama or the epos, and aims at establishing itself as an independent branch of the art. It then becomes what the German critics call an "Unding," that is, something that is neither the one thing nor the other, neither poetry or prose. Some have collected the wisdom of the poets and formed books of Poetical Quotations out of their sayings. In regard to them it is sufficient to say, that the wisdom selected has been rudely dragged from its living connections, whilst the beauty and poetry have been marred or left behind. Who ever could form the remotest idea of Shakspeare's genius by reading volumes of his best sayings. These remarks, respecting didactic poetry, may be made, we think, without detracting from the real

merit of our English didactic poets, and especially from Young's Night Thoughts, a much esteemed acquaintance of many serious persons. Even though we deny him the character of a true poet, we may read him with interest and profit by day as well as by night, just as often as we fall into his semi-poetical, semi-religious, and semi-philosophical sentimentalism.

A similar criticism may be made of the poetry, which takes as its theme some aspect of nature, or its varied aspects as they come before us in the seasons of the year. Here we have descriptive poetry, which, as a mere painting of the face of nature, has no unity, and, of course, is wanting in the animating soul of poetry. Here the theme is not an abstract generality, but a series of particular things, that stand in no connection with some central point of unity, or some general idea or purpose of man. Nature finds its true meaning in man, who is the centre and vanishing point of all her productions. Without man it is meaningless; it has neither sound, nor variation of color, and such must be the nature of all poetisings, that does not make man occupy a prominent position in the foreground. Descriptive, like didactic poetry, when separated from epic, dramatic, or lyric, is in a false position, and loses the aroma, which it exhales when in its proper relation, as something subordinate to the development of a truly human activity. Description is called for in poetry of every kind, but the true poet employs it only as it may serve to embody or to embellish thoughts that are struggling for expression in his breast. There is all the difference in the world between a professedly descriptive poem, and the descriptions which we have of nature, as they come forward in the Iliad, in the plays of Shakspeare, or in the better parts of Lord Byron's poetry. In the latter case, nature is made an organic part of the poem or play; it is the back ground of the scene in which men are actors, and from its hidden retreats, it seems to sympathize with the passions of men, or else to give omens of dark, frowning disapproval. In Goethe's Faust natural scenery stands in

intimate connection with the evolution of the deep problems of human life, whilst the landscape painting of Thompson's Seasons carries with it no such an earnest meaning.

Next to poetic themes, evolution, embodiment, or representation, claims the attention of the poet and illustrates his art. He carries within himself a unity, that must unfold itself in multiplicity, and this in accordance with inherent laws. The material which he employs in the process must, of course, be taken from the country or latitude in which he was born and educated, for he is as much the product of his age or country as its flora or its fauni. If he sings in the cold regions of the north, the poem though pervaded with warmth of feeling, has in its external aspect, something dreary, something akin to the appearance of northern scenery. It has nothing gorgeous about it; only here and there a flower, that has not been bitten by the northern blast, makes its appearance. If he sings in a more favored zone, where nature appears in her most diversified forms of beauty, where flowers bloom profusely, and a luxuriant foliage is vocal with the music of singing birds, he catches the spirit that animates the world around him, that slumbers on the hill-side, the river bank, or the hidden retreats of nature, and infuses it into his song. If he have genius, like Homer or Shakspeare, every appearance of nature, from the zephyr, blooming softly over gardens of roses, to the wild uproar of the tempest, is woven into his poem, stereotyped there, and consecrated for ever to the spirit of beauty. Natural scenery is thus rendered classic, and continues to excite local emotions in the mind of the traveller in a distant age, when temple and monument raised by the hand of art, lie in ruins around him. Who now needs make a voyage across the ocean, to form an idea of the scenery and the varied aspects of nature in Greece, her islands, and seas? Have they not been daguerreotyped on tablets more durable than brass? Are they not written in the chronicles of her poets?

Again, the poet constructs his song out of materials drawn from history and human experience in its widest

sense. With the freedom, that is not allowed to the prose writer, he traverses every walk of human life for his pictures or images of beauty. Turning from the outward to the inward world, he employs his own subjectivs feelings and embodies them in songs. He sings of his own sorrows and joys, of his disappointments and his hopes, of his loves and his hates, of his depressions and his aspirations. This is lyric poetry, which is entirely *subjective* in its chsracter. It includes the song, the ballad, the hymn and the elegy, and all those poetic effusions which have as their animating principle some deep feeling of the heart. It is subjective, but not in such a sense as to make it independent of the outward world. Feeling is called forth and modified by the circumstances in which the poet is placed, but these only serve as the occasion for poetic development, and hence though the lyric poet takes for his theme some interesting external subject, as Pindar the Grecian games, or Schiller the successive stages in the formation of the Church Bell, it is soon left out of sight amidst the exuberance of the poet's fancy and the variety of concordant feelings to which it has given rise. Further, lyric poetry is subjective, but not in such a sense, that divests it of its generality. The poet selects, with unerring instinct, amidst a chaos of conflicting emotions and feelings, only those which strike a sympathetic cord in the breast of men generally, and which carry in them a general significance. Without this, his poetry would be simply an ebullition of feeling, destitute of truth, and of no value or interest to his fellow men.

A still wider field of poetic wealth is found on the outside of the mind and heart of the individual poet, in the world of man at large, in nationalities and races, in the broad stream of history. Here again the poet selects the material, which he reduces to a poetic form. He summons into his presence the bravest, the wisest, the best man, the fairest and the most virtuous woman, and, having appropriated to his own use the beautiful in their character, he dismisses them and creates wiser, braver, more just and more chaste beings, for the ideal realms which he has spoken into existence. The

characters, thus formed, beautiful and complete in themselves, are, however, simply organs of the poem,—actors on the scene. They are, therefore, connected with some important event or epoch in history, and are made to play their part in the solution of the life-problems of the age. The poet cannot rest satisfied with drawing scenes or painting portraits. He therefore breathes into his ideal creatures the general or national spirit, in which he, as a genius lives and moves and has his being, and causes them to utter the wisdom, the virtue and the morality of his age or country. All true poetry is thus national in its costume, and is the best exponent of a nation's character and taste. Shakspeare has thus perhaps done more for the English nationality than all her historians. He has given it a form, instinct with life, and more durable than monuments of marble or brass.

But poetry, as in the case of art in general, constantly tends to rise above mere nature and to open up a communication with the supernatural world. The cosmos would be incomplete without the light of heaven shining down upon it. Accordingly, we find that poetry embodies more or less the theology or religious spirit of the country or age, in which it is produced, under a concrete form. If the poet be a heathen, like Hesiod or Homer, he sings believingly and piously of the gods and their relations to man, untroubled by the scepticism or the doubts of the philosopher, or, if he be a Christian, baptized in the deeper spirit of his age, he "soars above the Æonian mount," and animates his scenes with the benignant spirit of Christianity. If he borrow less of inspiration from the vale of Helicon, he drinks the more deeply from "Siloa's brook, that flowed fast by the oracle of God," and sings of the true God, of Christ and his Church, of the Cross and the Crown. The great Christian poets of the middle ages, Dante, Tasso, Ariosto and Calderon, are, under this view, the best historians of their times, which, to say the least, were intensely religious. Dante, in particular, who towers above

the rest, and disputes the palm of superior genius with Homer and Shakspeare, has concentrated in his sublime allegory, not only the wisdom and science of his times, but has given the most magnificent local habitation to the reigning religious and theological spirit of his age. He is the poet laureate of Christianity and the Church.

The poetry that thus sings of the world on the outside of the poet is called *epic* poetry, and, in distinction from the lyric, is *objective* in its character. It of course expresses just as fully the feelings of the poet, but here no longer do the notes of joy or sadness appear to fall from his own lyre, but are outwardly and objectively represented in an historical narrative,—in historical personages. The scene is usually laid in the heroic period of a nation's history—in an age replete with life and poetic spirit.

Dramatic poetry, on the other hand, unites the distinguishing features of lyric and epic. It has a developed totality, that is spread out before us as in the epos, and has, therefore, an *objective* character. Yet it is not so restricted as epic poetry to the historical and the past. In this respect it is universal and free. It avails itself when necessary of the lyric or *subjective* element, and permits the poet through the chorus, to give free activity to his own subjective feelings. The whole plot, moreover, is not something past and finished, but in a process of development before our eyes, and resulting from the subjective passions and interests of its heroes.

It is, however, not our object to speak in detail of the different kinds of poetry. This would lead to a much longer and a less general discussion than we have marked out for ourselves in this paper. German writers have reduced the sphere of art and of poetry to a rigidly scientific form, and it is to these we must refer the reader for further information. They have not only developed the idea of poetry, but traced it in its development from the first efforts of the muse up to the highest departments of poetry, the epic, the dramatic and lyric. And the classification in

their hands is all along felt to be based, not on mechanical, but strictly philosophical principles. The discussions throughout afford a rare repast to a scientific mind, as compared with the small criticism, which goes to make up our popular science of criticism.

In our own distracted age, it is, perhaps, in vain for us to look for those grand poetic creations, which were at once the bloom and the glory of the civilization of other days. With us a cold intellectualism, coupled with the spirit of negation, *der Geist der stets verneint*, has, in a great measure, dissolved the bonds of unity among men, and like a withering mildew, blasted the buddings of a child-like faith. May we not hope that our present state of disintegration is only transitional, designed by Providence to prepare the way for a more perfect unity and catholicity among men, than has ever yet been witnessed, when poetry shall take still higher flights, serve as the handmaid of faith and celebrate the union of heaven and earth, of God and man, as it has never done before.

A remark or two, suggested by the subject we have been considering, will close our present discussion.

The first remark we have to make, has regard to the *kind* of poets that should be read. A simple and very obvious rule is, that the *greatest* and the *best* should have a decided preference. This is a principle, which guides us in all our other selections. When we have access to cultivated fruit of a rare flavor, we do not collect the wild fruit of the mountain, and so, when the productions of the greatest geniuses that have ever lived are spread out before us, it does not argue the part of wisdom to pass them by, and to spend our time in communion with ordinary poets or writers of fiction. It is not wise, we say, to let Shakspeare lie unopened on our shelves, whilst we are trying to keep up with the current literature of the day, by being among the first to read every new work that makes a noise in the newspapers and professes to be a work of superior genius. Fiction should be read by all who aim at receiving

a liberal education, for when of the right kind, its tendency is to enoble and refine even more than science itself. But where shall it be found, if not in the works of those who have stood the test of the severest criticism. Of the ancient poets, that form a part of every regular course of liberal study, it is, of course, unnecessary for us here to speak. They are the best productions of antiquity. In our own literature, our great poets, Shakspeare, Spenser, Milton and a few others, should receive the first and the most prominent attention and careful reading. They are the sources from which most succeeding poets have caught their inspiration. Scott, though not so popular as he once was, nor so profound or spiritual as to be entitled to a place among poets of the first class, excels, however, in his descriptions of nature, and is, moreover, so pure in sentiment and feeling, that no one should deprive himself of the benefit of communion with him. Byron is a great poet, but not in the *beginning* nor the *concluding* part of his works. He of all others, has a magic spell for youthful minds. Imperceptibly he diffuses his misanthropic spirit into our breasts, and before we think of it, he would have us to array ourselves in a mad crusade against the human race as a whole. Some have been carried away so far by the Byronic spirit as to imitate his dress, his manners, his partiality for dogs, and even his fondness for intoxicating drinks. His better poems should be read, but with a critic's eye. The German language should be mastered, if for no other reason, with the view of reading Schiller and Goethe. The great Italian poets, are accessible to us in English translations. Dante, in particular, should be studied. The national epics of Spain and Portugal, the Cid and the Lusiad, we have in German translations. Lalla Rook is the nearest approach to an epic of Ireland. The poetry of ancient India has also been thrown open to us by the labor and industry of German scholars.

We have also a remark or two to make in regard to the *manner* and *spirit* in which the poets should be read. Poetry, as also the other fine arts, is frequently regarded as

nothing more than a source of pleasant enjoyment, an elegant amusement for the scholar, an agreeable relaxation from severe study, or simply an innocent mode of passing an idle hour. But beauty is thus dishonored and dragged down into the sphere of mere sensation and feeling. Under this view, as Theologians or Christians, we could not be expected to take any special interest in advocating the claims of poetry. It would, indeed, be more consistent with the high purposes of a Christian education, as Plato proposed, to have them banished altogether from our libraries and institutions of learning. But from what has been said, as well as from what has not been said, for want of time, both poetry and her sister arts, have a higher vocation than to serve as a refined species of Epicureanism or animal enjoyment. They are, as already affirmed, under the control of law throughout and are as susceptible of being reduced to the form of science, as the starry heavens, or the wonders of the vegetable or mineral world. Poetry is, therefore, a proper subject for scientific study and investigation, as any one may assure himself, if he takes up Macbeth and Hamlet, or any other play of Shakspeare's, not for the love story or the fine sayings it may contain, but to understand it, to examine it in the evolution of its different parts—to grasp its unity and to trace it in its diversity. The science of criticism, as we have it in Kame's Elements, is here no adequate guide. Æsthetics is a deeper science than that of criticism. It is indeed the only solid basis, upon which a true and reliable criticism can rest. In this new path of knowledge Carlyle and Coleridge have been our best pioneers, and have labored with good effect, in calling attention to it in the English language. But it may still be regarded as a science that is peculiarly German, and it is to German authors, that we must look for our best scientific guides in threading the mazes of art.

Poetry, we have said, should be read, not merely to drive away the horrors, or to satisfy our feelings of wonder or admiration, but for the purpose of scientific investigation. But there is still a higher point of observation, from which

it should be viewed. As a branch of art, it seeks to unfold the beautiful to our contemplation. This gives it a spiritual value, tends to raise it above nature and connects it with that world of purity, of truth and beauty, in which the troubled spirit of man looks for its eternal rest, when the toils and labors of this our sensuous life shall have come to an end. Natural, intellectual, or moral heauty, is an adumbration of that supernatural beauty, which emanates from God, and is reflected by happy spirits in their redeemed state. Here all art and science, and philosophy, which are given to us by our Creator, that they may serve as mute prophecies of his existence and glory find their vanishing point. Viewed in this light, art culminates in praise and divine worship, just as science finds its end in Theology, the knowledge of the true God. But viewed in any other light, the magnificent creations of the most gifted son of genius are merely phenominal, only gilded baubles on the ocean of life, or as one, who by experience, had realized the emptiness of earth, said:

like poppies spread;
You seize the flower, its bloom is shed,
Or like the snow falls in the river,
A moment white—then melts forever;
Or like the borealis race,
That flit ere you can point their place;
Or like the rainbow's lovely form
Evanishing amid the storm.

T. A.

Franklin and Marshall College,
Lancaster, Pa.

VI.—ON EXTEMPORE PREACHING.

To a superficial observer there are many things which seem to prove that *the Pulpit* has lost much of that influence it once possesed over the popular mind; and that by means of the mass-meeting, the platform, the lecturer, and above all, the press, it is daily losing still more its hold on the people, and is destined to take a subordinate place among those moral and intellectual forces which move mankind. We have often heard this statement made, and more frequently we are able to discern the effect of a conviction of its truth in the minds and conduct of men. Even the ministry itself shows a want of ability in some cases, to see its real position, and to call in and depend upon its own resources. And such have launched forth into the very tempest of popular excitement and have dragged into the pulpit, topics the only recommendation of which was novelty, and which were better handled by those uneasy spirits who live, and move, and have their being amid tumult and uproar.

The minister of religion is a Samson shorn when he is thus taken captive by the spirit of this world; and however great may be his apparent success, or however popular may be his new themes of public address, the success is only apparent, his followers are a rope of sand, and not unfrequently it is his fate to outlive his reputation, and endure the inexpressible chagrin of beholding himself in the position of a plaything cast aside by a wayward child.

Let the minister of Jesus Christ remember that he is an ambassador of God, beseeching men, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God; and that the source of his real power and influence is the Spirit of the living God, which Christ hath promised shall be with His Church and His servants, guiding them into all Truth and giving the Truth, as proclaimed by the faithful pastor, a power over men's hearts,

and so causing it to be the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. Let the ministry of Jesus Christ remember that Paul may plant and Apollos may water, but that God alone giveth the increase; and while this should bring down every high thought of man's power and sufficiency, either as to himself or the means he may employ, it is full of comfort, and should be a source of constant peace, to those that go forth weeping bearing precious seed, for, as God is faithful, they shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bearing their sheaves with them.

The Christian ministry is not similar to any other public instrumentality for moving the minds and hearts of men. It is God's agency for accomplishing God's purposes of mercy through the Gospel. "We have this treasure in earthen vessels that the excellency of the power may be of God and not of us." The power and influence, therefore, of the minister of Jesus Christ, is immeasurably beyond that of other men who may be attempting a spiritual work with carnal weapons. It is the privilege of the Pulpit, as it compares its glorious work with that of other reformers, and contemplates adoringly the Divine Source of its efficiency in the world, to say, "Where is the wise? Where is the Scribe? Where is the Disputer of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"

But while we thus declare that the real power of the pulpit must be found in the manifestation of the Spirit of God, we would not, on the one hand, urge this as any warrant for mere dogmatism or an *ex cathedra* treatment of men or measures; for the being set apart to a sacred office is very far from authorizing any man to treat men, or their convictions, with superciliousness or disrespect; nor would we, on the other hand, relying unduly or improperly on the supernatural element in religious truth, disregard those natural instrumentalities and aids by which truth in every form may be brought more clearly, and distinctly, and efficiently before the mind. While the Word of God and the Power of God are supreme, the laws of the human mind and the clear teachings of real science and philosophy can-

not and must not be disregarded. Indeed, the laws of the natural world, and the truth as eliminated from error by the experience of the world in every field of thought and action, are as much God's truth as His revealed Word, and are as supreme and unbending in their own sphere as any command in the Decalogue.

It is then, the privilege and the duty of the occupant of the pulpit to draw to his aid, in the exposition and enforcement of God's word, every legitimate means of moral and intellectual power. He should covet earnestly the best gifts of body, mind and heart; and yet, should constantly feel, while using every exertion to excel, that all the powers of his nature, developed to their best estate, fall short of the requirements of the great work in which he is engaged and the demands of the Master in whose name he speaks.

The mission of the Christian ambassador is to beseech men to become reconciled to God, through Jesus Christ. The end of eloquence is the persuasion of the hearer. It is plain, then, that eloquence, or speaking efficiently, is necessary to enable one to speak as becomes the oracles of God, and that no one of the elements of oratorical success can be neglected by the preacher without injury to the cause he represents. If one method of speaking is better than another, and the preacher, or the ministry in general, choose the worst, or are satisfied with that which is not the best, we need not wonder if they lose their hold on the popular mind in spite of the advantages they possess, derived from their official position, the nature of the subject they are called to discuss, and the place and the time of the discussion. While we would not, therefore, deny that there is some ground for the assertion, that the pulpit has lost influence, we are led to think that the main cause of any decline of power is a want of sympathy with the people, produced partly by an unnatural method of addressing them. If the politician, the lawyer, and the platform-speaker take great care to secure the sympathy of their audience, by bringing themselves into immediate contact with

every individual in the use of an extempore method of address, and the minister of religion adopt the colder and stiffer method of reading or reciting—if those are life and spirit, while these are formality and deadness, what wonder that the people go indeed dutifully to church as they would to a funeral, but show none of that alacrity and enthusiastic interest that they do when they listen to the real orator, even though the pulpit deal with eternal verities, whilst its rivals are mainly engaged with the interests of the passing day. "The real ruler and mover of men is, and will be, the man that can best influence by tone and living thought; that can speak to humanity in connection with religion, convincing the judgment, perfecting the reason, reconciling the conscience, establishing faith, nourishing earnestness, sustaining zeal, satisfying all felt wants, and filling the future with that which shall not only be hoped for, but achieved." While we cannot deny that this may be done by some men, as Chalmers, by a written discourse read, or as Bourdaloue, by one recited, we cannot doubt, that for the ministry in general, the extempore method will most certainly enable them to attain the great object for which they labor. We shall then endeavor to state some of the advantages to be gained from the extempore method of address in the pulpit, and shall give some directions for acquiring a facility in the use of it. As to the purely *impromptu* method—we have no doubt it is the worst possible; and we do not consider it worth another word.

1. That there are advantages to be gained from the extempore mode of addressing an audience may be safely argued from the practice, already alluded to, of public speakers in the other professions. It is almost invariably the style of address at the Bar, on the Platform, on the Stump, and in our Legislative halls; and though the greater solemnity of a discourse in the pulpit, and the weighty interests involved in the subject presented, may well awe the mind, rendering it much more difficult to speak with ease and propriety, yet the difficulty is not insurmountable, and once

overcome, there are compensating advantages enjoyed by the Pulpit over every other public arena. Nor are we without many notable examples of the great success of the method we are recommending, in the pulpit itself, in our own land, in Great Britain and on the Continent of Europe. The method of committing and reciting is, we may say, the rule in the Reformed Churches of Europe, but this paves the way for readily sliding into the extempore style, which prevails to a very great extent in the French and German pulpits, being the method of some of the most accomplished pulpit orators now living.

2. There is also a great attraction, for most hearers, in this method of speaking; which is due to the fact that it is *the most natural.* Men speak thus in social intercourse and in the marts of business. We readily speak thus ourselves; and the more we are interested in any matter, the easier our words flow forth. "Ex enim abundantia cordis os loquitur." Common sense can see no good reason why the greatest of all topics, the immortal interests of men, should be approached on stilts and handled with gloves. Sincerity ought to be at home in the pulpit. There is an instinctive approval in every breast when the preacher speaks like a man who talks with his friend. We ask, "Why should the man in public be a different man from the man in private? We plead for nature; let the man be himself. Why should he, in order that he may reach men's imaginations and hearts, robe himself in a frigid exclusiveness?"

The natural carriage of the body being a very general accompaniment of extempore speaking, has a very great effect in adding force and life to the discourse. The speaker stands erect; his face beams with the thought; his gesturing is expressive, or insensibly becomes so, and is oftentimes exceedingly graceful; the eye, that mirror of the soul, is at full liberty, and has a wonderful power in sending home to every heart the thought and feeling, and in fixing the attention—a most important matter—of those addressed: for if the speaker's attention is not confined to his

"brief" or "notes," he can readily observe the lagging interest of any of his hearers, and if need be,

"Can hold him with his eye."

The method of committing and reciting does not possess this attraction and power. The man may seem to be free, but we feel that he is not. The tones of the voice, the gestures, the language, the attitude, the pauses—all lack a certain something, which is, indeed, the freedom of nature. Even the eyes, though they are open and look at us, do not satisfy us. There is "no speculation in them." The same thing is true, to a great extent, of the reader. The man himself,—even after long habit has worn off the sharpness of his own impressions of his delivery—feels, as one has said, "as though he were speaking in a net; and what is worse, his hearers fully appreciate his condition.

3. Another advantage of the extempore is, that it is almost always accompanied with a high degree of *earnestness.* There can be no power in the pulpit without earnestness. A mere perfunctory performance will be rigid and cold as death and will move no one. True, an earnest soul may be able to infuse life and power into words and thoughts making them winged and burning, though written and read, or memorized and recited. But a prearranged concatenation of words will be apt to be a chain binding the wings of the fancy, fettering the expression of the thought, and curbing the manifestation of true feeling. Whereas, the untrammelled speaker becomes earnest *ex necessitate;* his action reacts; his mind warms, his eye enkindles; his heart, his very soul, burns within him as the subject opens and the discourse proceeds, and soon every individual within the sound of his voice feels the influence of the magic spell.

4. Moreover, it is a consideration worthy of the serious attention of the ministry, that the ability to speak without "notes" and without a memorized preparation, is a talent held in very high esteem by all men. The undisputed possession of it certainly increases the influence of the speaker, and secures the respect, and even the warm ad-

miration of the hearer. To obtain it, therefore, no pains should be spared by one who covets earnestly the best gifts.

5. On the other hand, the want of this ability exposes the minister to mortification, through his want of skill to supply the sudden emergency, or to speak appropriately on occasions constantly occurring in the daily life of every pastor, when he must speak on the spur of the moment, without a studied selection and arrangement of his words, or not speak at all, and thus lose a golden opportunity, perchance, of moving the hearts of his hearers, when God has stirred them by His Providence, or melted them by His sore bereavements.

6. The presence of an audience is a source of power and inspiration which should never be lost sight of by the preacher. Though it is possible to write, having the audiense mentally in view, it is a very difficult thing to do it well; and no man can derive from the ideal congregation that stimulus which flows of itself into the soul when the audience is really breathing before him. M. Bautain observes:—"The presence of hearers stimulates the orator and augments the elasticity of his mind and the vivacity of his tongue. We have spoken in this manner through life and have never been able to do otherwise. Many a time, however, have we made the attempt by preparing an exordium, a tirade, or a peroration, with the intention of speaking better, or in a more striking manner. But we have never succeeded in reciting what we had prepared, and in the manner in which we had constructed it. Our labored compositions have missed their object, and made us embarrassed or obscure." This is by no means a peculiar instance. As a general rule, a man will speak better than he can write; that is, better for the real purpose of speaking,—the persuasion of those who hear.

7. Again, and corroborative of our last remark, the extempore speaker is also able to take advantage of the new and happy thoughts and illustrations which occur to him at the moment of delivery, when his mind is excited by the discussion of his subject. Striking views of the truth to

be developed spring up before him; illustrations of the most apt and forceful character spontaneously present themselves; and not unfrequently it happens that the whole subject, and the method of its further treatment, is presented to the mind at one glance in an entirely new and original view; while for the successful elucidation of it, the previous preparation, so far from being lost or wasted, is the means by which the speaker is enabled to seize upon and actualize the beautiful and satisfying development of thought and feeling. "The completeness with which a subject is viewed and its parts arranged, does not depend so much on the time spent on it, as on the vigor with which the attention is applied to it. The habit of extemporaneous speaking is more than anything favorable to this from the necessity which it imposes of applying the mind with energy and thinking promptly." And the same habit gives the ability to use what it thus affords, as may suit the demands of the subject itself or the circumstances of the delivery.

8. There is so much severe labor in the work of the ministry at the present day, that it is no wonder the health of the active pastor often breaks down in the very midst of his toils. And it is a happy thing if a sea-voyage, a journey or a temporary respite of any kind, enables the over-tasked laborer to resume his duties. Not unseldom a permanent inability to discharge any ministerial labor is induced before the man is aware of his real state. Alas! we have followed to their last earthly resting place the mortal remains of those who have preached themselves into premature graves. That method of public speaking which will least injuriously affect the health of the preacher ought to commend itself strongly to every minister of the Gospel. As he values length of days and the privilege of proclaiming for many years the unsearchable riches of Christ, he should make it his duty to avoid as much as possible that method of preparation for the pulpit, or that kind of actual labor therein, which seriously menaces his mental or bodily health, and to adopt, to the extent of his

ability, that method which, with the proper performance of the work, will least rack and tear the body and the mind.

That the *memoriter* method is most injurious to the health, as well of the mind as the body, admits of little doubt. We have seen repeated instances of its disasterous effects on those who have resorted to it, and who have lamented their inability, after long habit, to break away from that deadly grasp which they realized was forcing them to ruin. Writing and reading, though by no means so trying to the constitution of the speaker as the *memoriter* plan, is nevertheless a very trying ordeal even for those in robust health. Confinement to the writing-desk for many hours per week, the unnatural position of the speaker that reads, and the wearing form of vocal delivery into which he is prone to fall, and the lack of that exhilerating excitement which accompanies the efforts of the extempore orator, giving him at the moment the strength required, all these things often combine in undermining the health—especially of the vocal organs—of the public speaker; and they are the causes, in the opinion of eminent physicians, of the great prevalence of bronchitis, clergyman's sore throat and ailments of a kindred nature. The extempore method almost insures immunity from these ills; and though it has its peculiar evils to be guarded against, they are not in the nature of direct attacks on the health; and, in any event, can be easily shunned by those who have already formed the habit of diligent study.

9. Our last remark prepares the way for the presentation of what we consider the most important advantage of the method we recommend, viz:—that it redeems time for study. The great labor of writing out word for word, or writing and committing one, two, or more discourses per week, so engages the time and attention of a minister as to give him no opportunity to attend to anything else. Pastoral labors are hurried through as rapidly as possible, or altogether per force neglected, because of the press of labor at the writing desk. The man becomes accustomed to

consider this the main business of his life; or if it become too irksome, it is regarded as a good or justifiable reason for a removal to some other field of labor where old preparations can in some measure relieve from the wearisome task. It is indeed very hard labor, and it is no wonder that he who conscientiously performs it, considers it hard *study*. But the truth is, the practice tends to keep him from many fields for real study, that he might have engaged in with pleasure and profit to himself and edification to his hearers. We do not see how it is possible for a minister, not gifted with extraordinary powers of mind and body, to do much more than get his sermons fairly written, if he write two sermons per week. As for spending much time in real study, the manual labor to be performed forbids it. If he think, pen in hand, as indeed he must, then he *writes extemporaneously;* and why should he not advance one step further and speak so? We are no advocate for slighting any labor actually required for a proper preparation for the pulpit. Not at all. The more of real study the preacher is able to perform, the better; and it is for the purpose of gaining the time to do this, that we advocate the dispensing with all unnecessary labor. "As for those whose indolence habitually prevails over principle, and who make no preparation for duty, excepting the mechanical one of covering a certain number of pages, they have no concern in the ministry, and should be driven to seek some other employment where their mechanical labor may provide them a livelihood without injuring their own souls or those of other men."

It will be expected by the reader that if the use of the extempore style be so important and advantageous to the preacher and hearer, we ought to give some hints to guide those who may be anxious to adopt, and to excel in, this mode of delivery. We will endeavor very briefly to do so; premising that the student or young preacher may consult with great profit the excellent treatise of M. Bautain on "Extempore speaking," which has just come into our hands, from the press of Mr. Scribner, in which the whole

subject is treated at large; and in connection with it may be read, "Ware's Essay on Extempore preaching," Dr. Porter's "Young Preacher's Manual," "Bridge's Christian Ministry," and the "Orator's Touchstone," all of which may be readily obtained at the Book-stores.

1. To acquire anything valuable, whether the cultivated excellence of natural qualifications, or the power to use the skill gained from art, or even an acquaintance with the ordinary branches of a good education, which is essential to every man who looks forward to a public position as a minister, *attention* is absolutely necessary. The mind must be fixed upon the object with vigorous concentration, and this must be done continuously. It must be a habit. Therefore, to acquire extempore ability the student, the preacher, must *bear it constantly in mind.* Those whom nature has gifted with a *fluent* utterance, will be apt to suppose that this is not necessary in their case; and those who, because of diffidence, nervousness, or inaptness in the acquisition and use of words, appear to be constitutionally incapacitated for an off-hand address, will probably imagine that no amount of attention to the matter will be of much avail. Each of these opinions, as a general thing, is a mistaken one. The fluent, loquacious, easy speaker or writer is in great danger of being carried away by the fatal facility of his gift of speech. But words are not thoughts. Water runs far more readily than molten metal. Deep feeling and real earnestness are full of an expression and condensed power utterly opposed to wordiness. The vulgar terms of "gas" and "wind," as designating the *copia verborum*, the interminable flow of the empty declaimer, shows the judgment of the people as to this matter; and the common-sense of mankind is not apt to be mistaken. On the other hand, a knowledge of our wants and a diligent attention to the means of gaining what we need, will go far indeed towards quieting the nervous system of the diffident and agitated speaker, and will also enable him to extend almost indefinitely his facility in the use of language. It may, however, require, in many cases, a long

and disheartening labor, as was the case with Demosthenes. "But then in this discipline the speaker's powers, mental and moral, are strained up to the highest intenseness of action; after *persevering practice*, they will become habitually subject to his control, and will work with a precision, exactness and energy, which can never be the possession of him who has depended on his native undisciplined gift."

2. Great care must be taken to acquire a *habit of using good language*. The man who goes slip-shod six days in the week, will not walk with ease and grace on the seventh in new shoes. If the language of every day-life is not well chosen and correct, it will be in vain to attempt to speak well in the pulpit, or even to write well in the study. This will partly explain why solecisms, vulgar phrases and idioms, common-places and cant expressions, &c., so abound in the public efforts of some men. The habitual use of good language in ordinary speech prepares for its use readily and almost without effort on occasions of more importance. What conduces greatly to form this faculty, is the frequenting good company; that is, as Mr. Bautain observes, "the society most distinguished for elegance of language and fine manners. There one learns to speak with correctness and grace, almost without study, by the mere force of habit." But as the young preacher, for various reasons, may not always be able to do this, he can in a great degree supply the place of it by cultivating the society of the masters of his language in books. This company is always accessible, and always ready to speak, so there is no excuse for neglect in this particular. The perusal of the best authors serves directly to supply the speaker with a copious fund of words, apt and elegant, and, moreover indirectly, by the elevation of the thoughts, the march of the sentences, and the majestic flow of the ideas, furnishes an *afflatus*, or divine glow, which prepares the orator for his intellectual labor, no matter how foreign may be the subject read from that about to be handled by the speaker. In addition to this, we would recommend storing

the memory with the *chefs d' oeuvre* of the best writers, the poets especially, to be recited mentally or aloud, during the daily walk or ride, by which one becomes habituated to the niceties of the language, and, as it were, makes them his own; nor must we forget to observe that no practice will more rapidly cultivate the taste and refine the whole man.

3. It is of great advantage also to form a habit of *analysing subjects;* taking them to pieces and looking at the logical nexus; passing in review link by link the concatenation of ideas. This analytic process should be regularly and systematically applied to every book read, and every speech listened to; pen or pencil in hand, if possible; and the student, when he has done this, should also exercise himself in the opposite synthetical process, and reconstruct, to the best of his ability, that which he has dissected, bringing bone to bone until he has the perfect skeleton rearranged. It should also be a daily exercise to prepare on paper a logical outline of the principal parts of the subject involved in some passage of Scripture; indicating, as clear as may be, the method of treatment. This will beget a logical habit of mind by which the speaker will naturally take a proper hold of his subject, and if need be on emergency he will be able to arrange its parts with great rapidity, and, even as he speaks, "mould it into shape."

4. A habit of *self-command* is necessary to the extempore speaker. This is to be gained by carefully avoiding every thing which tends to disturb the mind, or divide the attention; and by conscientiously doing the preliminary work which may be necessary for a suceessful public effort.

Every speaker, every minister especially, should avoid thinking anxiously about himself, his reputation, or of the probable effect of his discourse. All such thoughts savor of egotism, and are directly opposed to that singleness of mind requisite to a calm and deliberate presentation of the truth. Nor should the difficulties of the task be dwelt upon; the great end to be gained should be kept so distinctly before the mind, and should so fully engage the at-

tention, as to leave no room for the nervous timidity which hesitates at the first step. And the first step resolutely taken, the danger from this source is over.

Nothing so certainly secures self-command as the consciousness of having something to say. One of the most painful positions a man can be placed in is to feel compelled to speak *at* an audience, and know all the time that he is uttering platitudes, inflating trueisms, and nervously beating the air. This will destroy the self-possession of an intelligent man most rapidly. The security against it is to have made one's-self master of the subject by diligent study, and the careful elaboration of a written plan of discourse, well pondered over, and fully in the possession. This will give courage and self-possession to the timid and bashful speaker. "Let the mind perceive that it possesses its subject, that it is master of it so far as may be, and it then experiences a certain sense of security which is not without sweetness."

And as a final source of self-command,—though it may seem like a contradiction—we advise the preacher to be emptied of himself and to depend on the Divine assistance of the Lord he serves. "Lo! I am with you alway," is the promise; which should be received and pleaded in faith and confidently trusted to when the servant has done his part and needs more light and strength. Let him go from his knees to the pulpit, let him call on God when the fear of man is likely to paralyze his tongue, and he will be not only supported, but assisted, to accomplish what otherwise he never could have done.

5. We have already recommended *a thorough preparation of the plan* as an aid to self-command; we now remark, in general, that it is essential to extempore excellence. Ideas and conditions of mind cannot be extemporized; and the more perfectly they are possessed or felt, the greater is the probability of their being developed with force and clearness. Nec facundia deseret hunc, nec lucidus ordo. No man can communicate that which he does not possess. To teach the truth one must see it clearly, and comprehend

it, not as an isolated fact, but in its relations. To do this properly, a plan, or skeleton is necessary; written, so that it may be presented to the eye and looked at; for no one takes full possession of his thought until he has surveyed it on all sides and become really acquainted with it.

This written plan should be slowly elaborated, and only after it has been thoroughly digested, reviewed and put into the best possible form, should it be used as the foundation for any further meditation that the subject may need. It may then be carried about with the speaker, and he may think over the details of a more extended treatment at his leisure. But whatever he does, let him be careful not to think about his words, any effort at fixing them will only embarass. Verbaque provisam rem non invita sequentur.

6. For the *first attempts* the speaker should be careful to select subjects in which he feels an especial interest. If possible he should make the trial of his powers somewhere else than in the pulpit, for obvious reasons. And when he feels sufficient confidence to make the effort in the pulpit itself, he will find it greatly to his advantage to try an *exposition* of a chapter, or a parable, or some other extended portion of God's word.

7. It often happens that the extempore orator can begin and continue his address with very little effort; (prolixity is the besetting sin of the offhand speaker) but the difficulty is to finish well. The speaker would gladly come to an end, but does not feel able to close his speech or discourse appropriately. When this is caused by the speaker's neglect to prepare himself carefully for the conclusion,— under the notion that the close of a discourse is the easiest part of it,—he almost deserves to suffer all the pain and mortification attending a failure at the very end of what might otherwise have been a decided success. But this difficulty has occurred to good speakers after the best efforts at preparation. It is well, therefore, to have a rule by which any failure of this nature may be averted. M. Bautain's recommendation on this point is so excellent, we prefer to pre-

sent it in his own words: "There is a way of concluding, which is the most simple, the most rational and the least adopted. True, it gives little trouble and affords no room for pompous sentences, and that is why so many despise it, and do not even give it a thought. It consists merely of winding up by a rapid recapitulation of the whole discourse, presenting in sum what has been developed in the various parts, so as to enunciate only the leading ideas with their connections; a process which gives the opportunity of a nervous and lively summary, foreshortening all that has been stated, and making the remembrance and profitable application of it easy. And since you have spoken to gain some point, to convince and persuade your hearer, and thus influence his will by impressions and considerations, and finally by some paramount feeling which must give the finishing stroke and determine him to action, the epitome of the ideas must be itself strengthened, and, as it were, rendered living by a few touching words which inspirit the feeling in question at the last moment, so that the convinced and affected auditor shall be ready to do what he is required."

Greencastle, Pa. E. E.

Art. VII.—ANGLO-GERMAN HYMNS.

BY JAMES W. ALEXANDER, D. D.

I trust the readers will thank us for transferring to the columns of the Review the excellent translations of choice German hymns, which our esteemed friend, the Rev. Dr. James Alexander, of New York, furnished for the earlier volumes of Schaff's *Deutsche Kirchenfreund* (1849–1851), and which he kindly permits us to republish in this collected form. The rich treasures of German hymnology are beginning to be widely appreciated in England and America. Future compilers of English hymn books will do well to draw their material in part from such collections as H. Mills' *Horae Germanicae;* Miss Cath. Winkworth's *Lyra Germanica* (two Series); *Hymns from the Land of Luther; The Voice of Christian Life in Song, or Hymns of Many Lands and Ages;* and *Hymns of the Ages* (selections from Lyra Catholica, Germanica and other sources), to which must be added a still more recent collection published by the O. S. Presbyterian Board, in most beautiful style: *Sacred Lyrics from the German.* 1859.

But we know of no translations which combine to the same degree faithfulness and freedom, and may be called poetic reproductions in the very spirit of the author, as the versions of Dr. Alexander. Some of them, especially the beautiful passion hymn of Gerhardt, have become quite popular among us and have since passed into several recent American hymn books, but, unfortunately, in a greatly mutilated form, which does injustice both to the author and to the translator. We think it due to him to bring his versions more directly and extensively before the English public in their purity and integrity, for future use. The sacredness of literary property and of an original text as it came from the inspiration of the poet, seems to be hardly recognized, even as a notion, among modern compilers of hymn books. The interminable confusion which the passion for arbitrary changes and reckless mutilations, together with a want of poetic taste and a lowered tone of piety, introduced into German hymnology during the rationalistic period, ought to be a warning to us. But while Germany is recovering from its error and returning to the original fountains, we are pursuing the same false track. It is high time for a scientific work on hymnology and a careful critical edition of the classical English hymns, original and translated, as a proper *basis* for future hymn books. It would be a laborious and difficult task, but well worthy of the labor of years.

In the *Kirchenfreund* we published the German original in parallel columns with the translation. But as good German hymn books are becoming more and more accessible to the American reader, we have omitted it here. The translation from the French, accompanied by the original, has never been printed yet, and although not properly a hymn for public worship, will be found an acceptable addition.

P. S.

"*O Haupt voll Blut und Wunden.*"

NO. 1.

A Passion Hymn by PAUL GERHARDT, (born 1606, died 1776) on the basis of St. Bernard's *Salve caput cruentatum.*

1. O sacred Head, now wounded,
With grief and shame weighed down;
Now scornfully surrounded
With thorns, Thy only crown;
O sacred Head, what glory,
What bliss, till now was Thine!
Yet, though despised and gory,
I joy to call Thee mine.

2. O noblest brow, and dearest,
In other days the world
All feared, when Thou appearedst;
What shame on thee is hurl'd!
How art Thou pale with anguish,
With sore abuse and scorn;
How does that visage languish
Which once was bright as morn.

3. The blushes late residing
Upon that holy cheek,
The roses once abiding
Upon those lips so meek:
Alas! they have departed;
Wan Death has rifled all!
For weak, and broken-hearted,
I see Thy body fall.

4. What Thou, my Lord hast suffered
Was all for sinners gain:
Mine, mine was the transgression,
But Thine the deadly pain.
Lo! here I fall, my Saviour,
'Tis I deserve Thy place,
Look on me with Thy favor,
Vouchsafe to me Thy grace.

5. Receive me, my Redeemer,
My shepherd, make me Thine:
Of every good the fountain,
Thou art the spring of mine.
Thy lips with love distilling:
And milk of truth sincere,
With heaven's bliss are filling
The soul that trembles here.

6. Beside Thee, Lord, I've taken
My place—forbid me not!
Hence will I ne'er be shaken,
Though Thou to death be brought.
If pain's last paleness hold Thee,
In agony opprest—
Then, then will I enfold thee
Within this arm and breast!

7. The joy can ne'er be spoken—
Above all joys beside,
When in Thy body broken
I thus with safety hide.
My Lord of life, desiring
Thy glory now to see,
Beside the cross expiring
I'd breathe my soul to Thee.

8. What language shall I borrow
To thank Thee, dearest Friend,
For this, Thy dying sorrow,
Thy pity without end;
O make me Thine forever,
And should I fainting be,
Lord let me never, never
Outlive my love to Thee.

9. And when I am departing,
O part not Thou from me;
When mortal pangs are darting,
Come, Lord, and set me free;

And when my heart must languish
Amidst the final throe,
Release me from mine anguish
By Thine own pain and woe!

10. Be near me when I am dying,
O show Thy cross to me;
And for my succor flying,
Come, Lord, and set me free!
These eyes new faith receiving
From Jesus shall not move,
For he, who dies believing,
Dies safely through Thy love.

NO. 2.

"Wie soll ich Dich empfangen."

An Advent Hymn by PAUL GERHARDT.

1. Lord, how shall I be meeting,
And how shall I embrace
Thee, earth's desire, when greeting
My soul's adorning grace!
O Jesus, Jesus, holding
Thyself the flame in sight,
Show how, Thy beam beholding,
I may, my Lord, delight.

2. Fresh palms Thy Zion streweth,
And branches ever green,
And psalms my voice reneweth,
To raise my joy serene.
Such budding tribute paying
My heart shall hymn Thy praise,
Thy holy name obeying
With chiefest of my lays.

3. What hast Thou left ungranted,
To give me glad relief?
When soul and body panted
In utmost depth of grief,
In hour of degradation
Thy peace and pity smiled,
Then Thou, my soul's salvation,
Didst happy make Thy child.

4. I lay in slavish mourning,
Thou cam'st to set me free;
I sank in shame and scorning
Thou cam'st to comfort me.
Thou raised'st me to glory,
Bestowing highest good,
Not frail and transitory
Like wealth on earth pursued.

5. Nought, nought, did send Thee speeding
From mansions of the skies,
But love all love exceeding,
Love able to comprise
A world in pangs despairing,
Weighed down with thousand woes
That tongue would fail declaring,
But love doth fast enclose.

6. Grave on your heart this writing,
O band of mourners poor,
With pains and sorrows fighting,
That throng you more and more;
Dismiss the fear that sickens,
For lo! beside you see
Him who your heart now quickens
And comforts; here is He.

7. Why should you be detained
In trouble day and night,
As though He must be gained
By arm of human might,
He comes, He comes all willing,
All full of grace and love,
Those woes and troubles stilling
Well known to Him above.

8. Nor need ye tremble over
The guilt that gives distress.
No! Jesus all will cover
With grace and righteousness:

He comes, He comes, procuring
The peace of sin forgiven,
To all God's sons securing
Their part and lot in heaven.

9. Why heed ye then the crying
Of crafty foemen nigh?
Your Lord shall send them flying
In twinkling of an eye.
He comes, He comes, forever
A King, and earth's fell band
Shall prove in the endeavor
Too feeble to withstand.

10. He comes to judge the nations,
Wroth if they wrathful prove,
With sweet illuminations
To those who seek and love.
Come, come, O Sun eternal,
And all our souls convey
To endless bliss supernal
In yonder court of day.

NO. 3.

"Geh aus, mein Herz, und suche Freud."

A Summer Hymn by PAUL GERHARDT.

1. Go forth, my heart, and seek for praise
On these delightsome summer days
In what thy God bestows.
How rich the garden's beauties be,
How lavishly for me and thee
It doth its charms disclose.

2. The forest stands in leafy pride,
The earth is veiled on every side
With garb of freshest green!
The tulip and narcissus here
More wondrous in their pomp appear
Than Solomon was seen.

3. The lark floats high before the breeze,
The dove toward the forest-trees
From covert speeds along;
The song-enriched nightingale,
In ecstasy, fills hill and dale
And mount and plain with song.

4. The hen her tiny flock enfolds;
The stork his dwelling builds and holds;
The swallow feeds her brood;
The lightsome stag, the bounding roe,
Skipping from upland refuge go
To depths of grassy food.

5. The brawling brook adown the plain
Lines its fair margin fresh again
With myrtle-shadows deep.
The meadows green relieve the eye
And echo with the gladsome cry
Of shepherds and their sheep.

6. The never-weary tribe of bees
Now here now there in blossoming trees
Find booty far and near;
The sturdy juices of the vine
For sweetness and for strength combine,
The pilgrims toil to cheer.

7. The wheat lifts rank its ears of gold
To fill with joy both young and old,
Who learn the name to praise
Of Him who doth incessant pour
From heavenly love a matchless store,
Upon our sinful race.

8. And shall I, can I dumb remain!
No, every power shall sing again
To God, who loves us best.
Come, let me sing; all nature sings,
And all within me tribute brings
Streaming from out my breast.

9. Methinks, if here Thou art so fair,
And sufferest a love so rare
To poor earth's sons be given,
What gladness shall hereafter rise
In rich pavilion of the skies,
And golden tower of heaven!

10. What lofty pleasure, glory bright,
In Jesus' garden shall delight!
How shall the chorus ring,
When thousand thousand seraphim
With one consenting voice and hymn
Their Alleluia sing!

11. O were I there! O that, Thine own,
I stood, dear God, before Thy throne,
Bearing the victor's palm!
There would I, like the angel-choir,
Still sound thy worthy praises higher,
With many a glorious psalm.

12. But while I bear life's burden still,
With cheerful mind and voice I will
No longer hide Thy grace.
My heart shall ever more and more
Thy goodness and Thy love adore
Here and in every place.

13. Help now and on my spirit pour
Thy heavenly blessing evermore,
That, like a flower, to Thee
I may, through summer of Thy grace,
In my soul's garden all my days
The holy fruitage bear.

14. Choose me to bloom in Paradise
And, till in death I close my eyes,
Let soul and body thrive;
Being to Thee and to Thy praise,
To Thee alone, my lifelong days,
In earth and heaven, alive.

"Ich lass Dich nicht, Du muszt mein Jesus bleiben."

NO. 4.

A Jesus Hymn by W. C. Dessler, died 1722.

1.

I leave Thee not, thou art my Jesus ever,
Though earth rebel,
And death and hell
Would, from its steadfast hold, my faith dissever:
Ah no! I ever will
Cling to my helper still,
Hear what my love is taught,
Thou art my Jesus ever,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not!

2.

I leave Thee not, O love, of love the highest,
Though doubt display
Its battle-day;
I own the power which Thou my Lord appliest,
Thou didst bear gilt and woe;
Shall I to torment go
When into judgment brought?
O love, of love the highest,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

3

I leave Thee not, O thou who sweetly cheerest,
Whose fresh supplies
Cause strength to rise,
Just in the hour when faith's decay is nearest.
If sickness chill the soul,
And nights of languor roll,
My heart one hope hath caught,
O Thou who sweetly cheerest,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

4.

I leave Thee not, Thou help in tribulation;
By stroke on stroke,
Though almost broke,
I hope, when all seems near to desolation.
Do what Thou wilt with me,
I still must cling to Thee;
Thy grace I have besought,
Thou help in tribulation,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

5.

I leave Thee not, shall I forsake salvation?
No, Jesus, no!
Thou shalt not go;
Mine still Thou art, to free from condemnation.
After this fleeting night,
Thy presence brings me light,
Whose ray my soul hath sought;
Shall I forsake salvation?
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

6.

I leave Thee not, Thy word my way shall brighten;
With Thee I go
Through weal and woe,
Thy precept wise shall every burden lighten.
My Lord on thee I hang,
Nor heed the journey's pang,
Though thorny be my lot.
Let but Thy word enlighten,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

7

I leave Thee not, ev'n in the lap of pleasure,
For when I stray
Without Thy ray,
My richest joy must cease to be a treasure.
I shudder at the glee,
When no delight from Thee
Has heartfelt peace begot;
Ev'n in the lap of pleasure,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

8

I leave Thee not, my God, my Lord, my heaven,
Nor death shall rend
From Thee, my friend,
Who for my soul Thyself to death hast given.
For Thou didst die for me,
And love goes back to Thee,
My God, my life, my heaven,
I leave Thee not, I leave Thee not.

NO. 5.

"Endlich bricht der heisse Tiegel."

By F. Hartmann, died 1812.

1. Now the crucible is breaking;
Now my faith its seal is taking;
Molten gold, unhurt by fire,
Only thus 'tis ever given,
Up to joys of highest heaven,
For God's children to aspire.

2. Thus, by griefs, the Lord is moulding
Mind and spirit, here unfolding
His own image, to endure.
Now He shapes our dust, but later
Is the inner man's creator;
Thus He works by trial sure.

3. Sorrows quell our insurrection,
Bring our members to subjection,
Under Christ's prevailing will;
While the broken powers He raises
To the work of holy praises
Quietly and softly still.

4. Sorrows gather home the senses,
Lest, seduced by earth's pretences,
They should after idols stroll,
Like an angel guard, repelling
Evil from the inmost dwelling,
Bringing order to the soul.

5. Sorrow now the harp is stringing
For the everlasting singing,
Teaching us to soar above;
Where the blessed choir, palm-bearing,
Harps are playing, crowns are wearing,
Round the throne with songs of love.

6. Sorrow makes alert and daring;
Sorrow is our clay preparing
For the cold rest of the grave;
Sorrow is a herald, hasting,
Of that springtide whose unwasting
Health the dying soul shall save.

7. Sorrow makes our faith abiding,
Lowly, child-like, and confiding;
Sorrow! who can speak thy grace!
Earth may name the tribulation,
Heaven has nobler appellation;
Not thus honored all our race.

8. Brethren these our perturbations,
Step by step, through many stations,
Lead disciples to their sun.
Soon—though many a pang has wasted,
Soon—though many a death been tasted,
Sorrows watch of sighs is done.

9. Though the healthful powers were willing,
All the Master's will fulfilling
By obedience to be tried,
O 'tis still no less a blessing.
Such a Master's care possessing,
In His furnace to abide.

10. In the depth of keenest anguish,
More and more the heart shall languish
After Jesus' loving heart,
For one blessing only crying;
"Make me like Thee in Thy dying,
Then Thy endless life impart."

11. 'Till at length, with sighs all breaking,
Through each bond its passage taking,
Lo! the vail is rent in twain!
Who remembers now earth's treasure!
What a sea of godlike pleasure
High in heaven swells amain!

12. Now, with Jesus ever reigning
Where the ransomed home are gaining,
Bathing in the endless light,
All the heavenly ones are meeting!
Brothers—sisters—let us, greeting,
Claim them ours, by kindred right.

13. Jesus! toward that height of heaven
May a prospect clear be given,
Till the parting hour shall come.
Then, from pangs emerging brightly,
May we all be wafted lightly
By angelic convoy home!

NO. 6.

A Christian Sonnet by DES BARREAUX of the seventeenth century, who, like Beza, was first an Anacreontic poet and then a penitent psalmist.

Grand Dieu! tes jugements sont remplis d' equité,
Toujours tu as plaisir á nous être propice,
Mais j'ai tant fait de mal, que jamais ta bonté
Ne me pardonnera, sans choquer* ta justice.

Oui, mon Dieu, la grandeur de mon iniquite
Ne laisse á ton pouvoir que le choix de supplice,
Ton intérêt s' oppose á ma félicité,
Et ta clémence même attend que je périsse.

Contente ton désir, puisqu' il t' est glorieux,
Offense-toi des pleurs qui content de mes yeux,
Tonne, frappe, il est temps, rends-moi guerre pour guerre,

J'adore, en périssant, la raison qui t' aigrit,
Mais dessus quel endroit tombera ton tonnerre
Qui ne soit tout couvert du sang de Jesus Christ?

The same translated by Dr. J. W. A.

Great God! Thy judgments endless right disclose,
Grace for the sinner Thou dost still devise;
But I have sinned so much, that goodness knows
No way to pardon, unless justice dies.

Yes,—O my God, sins that so vastly rise
Leave to Thy greatness but the choice of woes,
Thy throne's high interest my bliss denies,
And mercy's self stands watching for my throes.

Sate Thy revenge, for this Thy glory cries,
Scorn Thou the tears which overflow mine eyes,
Launch lightnings, 'tis high time, I war invoke,

And, doomed, I worship, sinking in the flood;
Yet on what spot shall fall Thy thunderstroke
Not wholly covered with my Saviour's blood?

* In our copy of Des Barreaux we read: qu'en blessant.

Art. VIII.—THE CRYSTAL PALACE AT SYDENHAM.

The Crystal Palace at Sydenham alone is worth a trip to Europe. Such a collection and reproduction of the wonders of the world has never been seen before. You may spend there days and weeks and months in the study of the works of nature and art, representing the most distant climes, and all the ages of history, from the first dawn of civilization to the immediate present. Only the universal culture of our century could conceive the idea of such a microcosmos of art, and only by a nation like the English, and in a city like London, could it be carried into actual existence.

The Crystal Palace of Sydenham is a reconstruction, on an enlarged plan, of the Crystal Palace erected in Hyde Park, at London, for the celebrated Exhibition of 1851, and a transformation of this temporary receiving-house of the world's industrial wealth into a permanent temple of art and education. An attempt was first made to induce the Government to purchase the building in Hyde Park for the benefit of the nation, but without success. Then a company of private gentlemen and business men of London, at the suggestion of Mr. Joseph Leech, resolved to save the wonderful structure, by taking it down and rebuilding it on a more comprehensive and magnificent scale at Sydenham, on the London and Brighton Railroad, for permanent service. Their intention was "to form a palace—the first marvelous example of a new style of architecture—for the multitude, where, at all times, protected from the inclement varieties of the English climate, healthful exercise and wholesome recreation should be easily attainable; to raise the enjoyments and amusements of the English people, and especially to afford to the inhabitants of London, in wholesome country air, amidst the beauties of nature, the elevating treasures of art and the instructive

marvels of science, an accessible and inexpensive substitute for the injurious and debasing amusements of a crowded metropolis; to blend for them instruction with pleasure, to educate them by the eye, to quicken and purify their taste by the habit of recognizing the beautiful; to place them amidst the trees, flowers and plants of all countries and of all climates, and to attract them to the study of the natural sciences, by displaying their most interesting examples; and making known all the achievements of modern industry, and the marvels of mechanical manufactures."

These gentlemen bought the Crystal Palace in May, 1852, and a tract of three hundred acres of ground at Sydenham, formed a company of stockholders, with the proposed capital of half a million of pounds—but the building has already cost five times as much—entrusted the work of reconstruction to Sir Joseph Paxton and other eminent men, who had distinguished themselves by their labors for the building in Hyde Park, and made the most extensive arrangements for the collection of works of art and specimens of natural history. They procured casts of the most remarkable monuments scattered over England; they sent a delegation to the Continent, with the best recommendations, which were regarded everywhere, except in Rome, Padua and Vienna, to secure copies of the great works of architecture, sculpture and painting, from the times of ancient Egypt to the present era. No trouble and expense was spared to raise the new Crystal Palace above the richest institutions and collections of the kind in the world, and to make it, as far as lies within man's power, a depository of all the wonders of creation, for the benefit and enjoyment of the people.

With an energy and dispatch peculiar to the Anglo-Saxon race, and with a host of artists and laborers of almost every nation of Europe, such as only English wealth could command, the building was completed in the incredibly short time of two years, and solemnly consecrated by the Queen on the 10th of June, 1854.

The collections and internal arrangements, as well as the

improvements of the pleasure-grounds around the building, have also sufficiently progressed to afford the visitors a full idea of the whole; and the danger is only, that the establishment might be so overloaded as to destroy the character of unity, and to make it impossible to see the forest on account of the trees. The *μηδὲν ἄγαν* of the Greeks, and the *Ne quid nimis* of the Romans, is after all a golden rule, applicable also to such an institution. Already the palaces and collections of Versailles, the Louvre of Paris, and the Vatican of Rome, have such an overwhelming, not to say crushing, effect upon the senses and imagination; how much more the Crystal Palace, after it shall be once fully completed. Then it is well known that the English have better taste in the comfortable arrangement of a parlor than an artistic collection. In this respect the British Museum is far behind the Louvre at Paris, the Pinakothek and Glyptothek at Munich, and the old and new Museum at Berlin.

Ever since the opening of the new Crystal Palace in June, 1854, it has been visited by thousands and thousands of persons every day, excepting Sunday, which the Company and the Government, in spite of many plausible petitions, have very wisely refused thus far to have secularized and profaned by amusements, however innocent, in their proper time and place. Trains of cars leave London Bridge every twenty minutes from morning till evening, and bring the visitors in less than a quarter of an hour to the small village of Sydenham, in Kent.

The first object of attention is, of course, the Palace itself, the like of which the world has never seen. The late Crystal Palace of New York can give but a very faint idea of it. Imagine a building covering an area of nearly six hundred thousand superficial feet, extending over three-quarters of a mile of ground, and rising, in the central transept, to a height of 208 feet; consisting of a grand central nave of 1,608 feet in length, two side aisles, two main galleries, three transepts, two wings of 574 feet each, and a colonnade of 720 feet; constructed almost entirely of iron

and glass, the panes of which, if laid end to end, would extend to the almost incredible length of 242 miles; yet with all these vast proportions, simple in design, consistent in execution, and presenting a harmonious whole of transparent brilliancy and ærial lightness; erected on a beautiful elevation, with a commanding view over the silent country around, and the largest city in Christendom at the distance —imagine all this, and you have a structure which, for grandeur and magical effect, for union of strength and lightness, of ease of erection and capability of endurance, throws the famous ruins of ancient Thebes, Baalbec, Palmyra, Nineveh, Susa and Persepolis, the Parthenon of Athens, the Alhambra of the Moors, the Vatican of Rome, the Louvre of Paris, and the Palace of Versailles into the shade, and seems to have descended from fairy-land, to pay simply a passing visit to this lower world.

But then the contents! After I had ascended the steps of the magnificent covered colonnade and passed the Refreshment Rooms, and after I had somewhat recovered from the overpowering effect of the general appearance of the central nave, with its fountains and innumerable objects of curiosity, I was first struck with the Screen of all the Kings and Queens of England, including as I was glad to see, even Oliver Cromwell, and then with the *Natural History department.* This is arranged on a plan which has never been attempted before. Its peculiar merit consists in the geographical groupings of men, animals and plants, so as to enable the visitors to study Ethnology, Zoology and Botany at one glance, and in their natural relations and connections.

There you see, surrounded by the vegetation of South Africa, a group of tall, brown-faced, woolly-haired, warlike Zulu Kaffres, with a giraffe, a Cape hunting-dog, and close by a lion and cub, a hyena, and a battle between a leopard and a duyker-bok. India is represented by Hindoos and a tiger hunt, one tiger lying on his back in consequence of a wound from the howdah, or car, on the elephant's back, the other seeking to revenge his companion

by an attack upon the persons in the howdah, and causing the elephant to start off from the scene of action with the speed of terror—all this in the midst of rhododendrons, the Indian-rubber tree, the tea-plant, the drooping juniperus recurva, and other products of the luxuriant soil of the East Indies. The Indian islands are illustrated by a party of natives from Borneo in their war dresses, a group of Sumatrans, with three opium-eaters from Java, a black leopard, two Malay bears, and a case of birds. The New World has likewise received its large share of attention. There you have, first, a graphic illustration of the Arctic regions, a number of short, broad-faced, long-haired, plump and fat Esquimaux, different kinds of fox, and four Esquimaux dogs on snow-covered rocks, two polar bears, the reindeer feeding upon the moss, and close at hand the seal-skin summer tent of a Greenlander, with one of their canoes. Passing the tent, you see the red Indians engaged in a war-dance, and surrounded by the animals, trees and shrubs of North America. Then the natural life of Central and South America is exhibited by specimens of the various Indian tribes, Peruvians and Botocudos, the spotted and the black jaguar contesting the prey of a deer, the harpy eagle, waiting on the rocks to pick the bones of the hapless animal, the llama, the tapir, or elephant of the New World, the ant-eater, the Brazilian ostrich, a puma crouching at the sight of a rattlesnake, the Chilian eagle devouring a curassow. The collection is already so rich as to give you a clearer and more vivid idea of the wonders of natural history than you can get anywhere on so small a space and in so short a time.

From the works of nature, I passed to the productions of nature's king. Here I was especially interested in the reconstructions and recasts of the most celebrated works of architecture and sculpture from the remote ages of Egypt to the sixteenth century after Christ. Remarkable in themselves, they embody at the same time, the genius and character of the different nations represented, and thus give you a visible history of art, civilization and religion, for a period of more than three thousand years.

Let us walk through the whole central nave alongside of Osler's Crystal Fountain, and hundreds of statues, busts, and trees and plants from all climes, to the north end of the building, and commence with the *Assyrian* Court. It is the largest, (120 feet long, 50 feet wide, and 40 feet high,) and in some respects the most interesting. For it illustrates a new and singular style of art, which has only become known since the recent discoveries and excavations of the gigantic ruins of Nineveh, first by Botta, the French Consul at Mosul, and afterwards by Layard—ruins which corroborate, in a most remarkable manner, certain statements of the Old Testament connected with Jewish history. The Court represents the general style of palaces, which prevailed in the once mighty Assyrian Empire, between the reign of Sennacherib and that of Xerxes, from the eighth to the sixth century before Christ. The most striking and imposing features are the works of sculpture on the walls, copied from the originals, which Mr. Layard excavated at Nimroud, and deposited in the British Museum, especially the colossal winged man-headed bulls covered with arrow-headed figures, and serving as door-gates, the giants strangling lions, (supposed to represent the Assyrian Hercules,) on each side of the front, and the winged lions behind the central hall.

Regaining the nave we pass into the *Egyptian* Court, through an avenue of lions, cast from a pair which Lord Prudhoe brought from the shores of the Nile. It exhibits a temple of the Ptolemaic period, about 300 years B. C. ornamented with colored sunk-reliefs, and pictures illustrative of Egyptian history and religion, and a hieroglyphic inscription stating that "in the seventeenth year of the reign of Victoria, the ruler of the waves, this palace was erected and furnished with a thousand statues, a thousand plants, &c., like as a book for the use of man of all countries." Eight gigantic figures of Rameses the Great, form the facade of another temple, representing a much earlier period of about 1,300 B. C. A few steps more take you into a dark tomb, the most antique piece of architecture

in the Crystal Palace, (about 1,660 B. C.) copied from one at Beni Hassan ; and passing on, you meet a great number of scattered statues and other remains of bygone days, from the land of hieroglyphics, sphinxes, mummies, pyramids, and enduring tombs for the long sleep of death. But the most imposing works which affords us the best idea of the enormous magnitude and massive grandeur of ancient Egyptian art, are the two colossal statues of Rameses the Great, sixty-five feet high, towering to the roof of the transept. They were reproduced on the scale of the originals in the temple of Rameses, at Aboo Simble, in Nubia, whose origin goes back to the sixteenth century before Christ.

From the stupendous proportions, the monstrous grandeur, the repulsive austereness, and mysterious gloom of these Oriental monuments, we gladly step into the more genial clime, and the bright sunshine of *classical* art, to admire those simple, graceful and ideal forms, which to this day are justly regarded as models of beauty and pure taste.

Here we must mention first, the *Greek* Court, containing an admirable model of the incomparable Parthenon and other temples, with mythological decorations; the Agora ; a gallery of the noblest statues and groups of the classical period, such as the inimitable remains from the frieze and pediment of the Parthenon, Laocoon, Niobe, the Belvedere Torso, the Venus de Medici, &c. ; also busts of the illustrious poets, philosophers, orators and statesmen of that wonderful nation whose special mission it was to develop the idea of beauty, and the first principles of philosophy and art, while law and policy was the peculiar department of the Romans, and religion the sacred trust of the Hebrews.

The *Roman* Court is adorned with Roman arches, decorated marble structures, and a great number of busts of Roman warriors, Kings, Emperors, and Empresses, and mythological statues from the most successful imitations of Greek models, as in the case of the Apollo of Belvedere, and the Diana with the Deer, down to the lowest degrada-

tion of art, to wanton luxuriousness. There we see also, the representation of a part of the Coliseum, which at the time of Vespasian and Titus, could accommodate 87,000 persons for the contemplation of chariot-races, naval engagements, and combats of wild beasts, but is now a magnificent pile of ruins—a fit emblem of the humbled pride, and the departed glory of the Roman Empire.

Equally instructive and interesting is the *Pompeian* Court, an exquisite reconstruction of one of the old Roman houses, as they were brought to light by successive excavations since 1721, after the sleep of seventeen hundred years, from the grave of cinders and ashes vomited forth by Vesuvius in the terrible erruption of 79. As you pass through the narrow "prothyrum," with the caution on the pavement "*cave canem*," into the open court, or "atrium" with the marble basin, ("impluvium,") which received the rain from the roof ("compluvium;") and then turn to the left of the "tablinum" into the "cubicula," the close, but richly decorated dormitories; from here to the dining room or "triclinium," on the opposite side, and crossing the "peristyle," with its red columns, to the bath and back to the "lararium," or the domestic altar, with the lamp and the picture of the patron god—you seem to be transferred as by magic to the long departed times of ancient Roman virtue and vice, heathen piety and superstition, and to converse with Tacitus and Pliny on that awful flood of burning lava which destroyed Herculaneum and Pompeii, and at the same time perpetuated their story in death for the benefit of future generations.

Again you are transformed into a different world by stepping into the *Alhambra* Court, and gazing at the dazzling walls and mosaic pavements of the richest specimens of Moorish architecture, copied from the very ruins of the vast fortress-palace near Granada in the south of Spain. The arabesque ornaments, the gorgeous splendor and romantic richness of decorations, the lines of the marble fountains, the pleasant music of the falling waters, the fragrant perfume of flowers, and the inscription: "There is no conqueror but

God," places you amidst the luxuries of Oriental life in the proudest days of Mohammedanism.

But we must turn to the other side of the nave towards the garden of the Palace, and take a short glance at the Courts which exhibit to us the various phases of *Christian* art. They are, however, not complete architectural restorations, as the pagan courts, but rather as many collections of characteristic ornamental details, or entire portions of the most remarkable works of English, German, French, Dutch and Italian architecture and sculpture, from the sixth to the sixteenth centuries. As to selection and arrangement, I would have many objections to make, were I disposed to be fault-finding. But we would rather learn and admire here, than criticise.

How different is the atmosphere into which we now enter, as different as Christianity is from heathenism. The Greek and Roman temples express a perfect satisfaction with this present world of sense, and the entire absence of a longing after the infinite and eternal. But these Byzantine and Gothic churches, with their crosses, arches, towers, sculptures, windows, sepulchres, seem to embody deep and solemn mysteries, and point from earth to heaven, from time to eternity, from the passing vanities of the natural to the unchanging realities of the supernatural world.

The oblong Basilica, the oldest style of Christian churches, founded on the Roman halls of justice, is not represented. But the *Byzantine* Court gives us an idea of the characteristic features—the Greek cross, the round arch, the central dome, and the mosaic ornament—of that architecture which flourished from the sixth to the eleventh centuries, and of which Santa Sophia in Constantinople, built by Emperor Justinian, several churches in Ravenna, and San Marco of Venice are the most perfect speciments. In the same department we have various illustrations of the *German Romanseque* and the *Norman* styles, copied from several cathedrals of Germany, Northern Italy, France, England and Ireland. On either side of the black marble fountain

in the centre—an exact eopy of one at Heisterbach on the Rhine—are the well-known effiges of Fontevrault Abbey, (the burying-places of the Plantagenets,) from the thirteenth century, representing King Henry II., Eleonora, his wife, Richard I., and Isabella, wife of King John.

Next comes the *German Mediæval* Court, devoted exclusively to examples of the Gothic style, with its pointed arches, its lofty towers, its solemn gloom, its stained windows, from the twelfth down to the fifteenth centuries.—The specimens are taken from the sublime cathedrals of Nuremberg, Cologne, Mayence and Prague. The walls are adorned with the admirable reliefs ef Adam Krafft, and Veit Stoss, of Nuremberg, representing the Betrayal of Christ, the Mount of Olives, and the Last Supper, and a rose, wreath and cross.

The *English Mediæval* Court contains some of the most characteristic illustrations of the Gothic style of architecture and sculpture, as it prevailed in England during the same period. They are taken from the beautiful cathedrals, chapels, and sepulchral monuments of Ely, York, Canterbury, and Westminster Abbey, and form a most valuable and interesting museum of English mediæval art.

The *French* and *Italian Mediæval* Courts represent arches, arcades, statues and altar-pieces of Notre Dame at Paris, the cathedral at Chartres, San Michele at Florence, &c.

A few steps further southward is the *Recaissanne* Court. This exhibits the revival of the antique style in Italy at the beginning of the fifteenth century, when Brunelleschi reared the dome of the magnificent Madonna del fiora, at Florence, and Ghiberti constructed, in its immediate vicinity, the wonderful bronze doors of the Baptistery which Michael Angelo pronounced worthy to be the "gates of Paradise."

The adjoining court is devoted to the architecture and sculpture of the age of Queen *Elizabeth*, or the latter part of the sixteeeth century, which is characterized by rectangular ornamentation, palatial grandeur and striking picturesqueness. Here are, among other monuments, the

sepulchres of the two rival Queens from the originals in Westminster Abbey, Elizabeth proudly holding the sceptre, the unfortunate Mary Stuart piously folding her hands; both proclaiming, on their cold marble bed, the vanity of earthly glory and physical beauty.

The *Italian* Court is enriched with various specimens of the modernized Roman style of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, to which belong St. Peter's at Rome, the Palazzo Pitti at Florence, the Colonnade of the Louvre in Paris, the Escurial, near Madrid, and St. Paul's at London. This court is founded on a portion of one of the finest palaces in Rome, that of Farnese, commenced by Sangallo, and finished by Michael Angelo. Here are also copies of some of those world-renowned frescoes of Raffaelle in the loggie of the Vatican, and Michael Angelo's monument of Lorenzo de Medici.

This is but a very cursory view of the Fine Art Courts. To give a full description of the Crystal Palace, we would have to introduce the reader into the *Industrial* Courts, with their rich display of the practical and useful arts of modern England and the Continent. Then we should glance at the hundreds of statues and busts of the illustrious monarchs, statesmen, captains, scholars, poets, artists and benefactors of the civilized nations, scattered through the nave and central transept, alongside of the choicest trees and plants from all parts of the world.

Having thus explored the length and breadth of the ground floor, we descend to the basement story, which is partly devoted to the exhibition of machinery in active motion. Then we ascend the main upper galleries, to admire the collection of paintings, photographs, philosophical instruments, and an endless variety of articles of industry and fancy, and especially, also, to obtain a bird's-eye view of the unrivaled *ensemble* of wonders below.

Finally, overwhelmed with impressions of the works of nature and man, we leave the Palace, and standing on the magnificent terrace, we see spread out before us, on two hundred acres of ground, the beautiful park and gardens,

the symmetrical order, the straight walks, the regular alleys, the well-trimmed trees and hedges, the artificial beds, the ornamental fountains, and the architectural and sculptural display of the Italian style, as well as the irregular beauty, the natural ease and freedom, the wild luxuriance, the green meadows, the noble groups of stately trees, the winding walks, the gentle slopes of English landscape; then, further on, the geological illustrations and the zoological islands, with the restored forms of extinct animals, the ichthyosaurus or fish-lizard, the teleosaurus, the plesiosaurus, the hylæosaurus, the megatherium, the palæotherium, the anoplotherium, and other strange figures of the antediluvian world, as described, from their petrified relics, by the learning of Cuvier and Owen, and reconstructed by the art of Waterhouse Hawkins; and beyond the precincts of the Palace, stretching away into the far distance, the great garden of nature herself, the work of God's finger, the temple of the Almighty, with heaven's blue dome.

In view of such an unrivaled panorama of nature and art, you will be amazed at the wealth and genius of the English nation, and understand why we said at the beginning, the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, alone, is worth a trip to Europe.

I spent several days in this instructive and deligthful temple of science and art. The 28th of October, 1854, presented a sight of unusual grandeur and interest at Sydenham, which I shall never forget. The celebration of the bloody victory of Alma, for the benefit of the fallen and wounded soldiers of Albion, attracted at least fifty thousand visitors to the Palace. People from all classes of society, and all nations of the earth, came pouring in every ten minutes from London Bridge station, and in an endless succession of omnibuses, cabs, and carriages, from every direction. The Emperor Napoleon III. had generously sent his best musical bands, in richest military costume, to join with those of Queen Victoria, and thus to give additional solemnity to the occasion. I went this time in a private conveyance with the excellent family of Mr.

John Gladstone, (not the distinguished Ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer, but a distant relative of his) in whose beautiful home at Stockwell Lodge, near London, I enjoyed, for several days, all the comforts and pleasures which the most hearty and thoughtful English hospitality could suggest and which I shall always gratefully remember. I did not know what to admire most, the magnificent building, with its endless variety of curiosities, or the inspiring strains of the finest military music resounding from the Palace and the terraces, or the dazzling brilliancy of beauty and fashion displayed by the aristocracy and gentry of England. The eyes, the ears, the imagination, and the feelings were drunk with delight, and seemed to move amongst the visions and melodies of fairy land. Perfect order and dignity reigned in this ocean of men. All was joy and gladness, patriotism and enthusiasm. The *entente cordiale* between the two greatest civilized nations appeared to be complete, and broke out in bursts of applause and hurrahs, in hopeful anticipation of the speedy down-fall of Sevastopol, and the complete triumph of the allied armies and fleets over the mighty empire of the Czar.

But yet one dark cloud overshadowed the festivity. The mournful sounds from the battle-field of the Crimea and the hospitals of Scutari re-echoed in the Crystal Palace, amidst the strains of "God Save the Queen;" and many of the noblest families of England and France deplored, at this very hour, the loss of brave fathers, brothers, and sons. The news of the brilliant but disastrous charge of the Light Brigade, at Balaklava, on the 25th of October, was already on its way to proud and happy mansions, to fill them with the mingled feelings of joy and gloom:

"Cannon to right of them,
Cannon to left of them,
Cannon in front of them,
Volleyed and thundered;
Stormed at with shot and shell,
Boldly they rode and well
Into the jaws of Death,
Into the mouth of Hell,
Rode the six hundred.

"Flashed all their sabres bare,
Flashed all at once in air,
Sabring the gunners there,
Charging an army, while
All the world wondered:
Plunged in the battery smoke,
With many a desperate stroke,
The Russian line they broke;
Then they rode back, but not—
Not the six hundred.

"Cannon to right of them,
Cannon to left of them,
Cannon behind them
Volleyed and thundered;
Stormed at with shot and shell,
While horse and hero fell,
Those that had fought so well,
Came from the jaws of Death,
Back from the mouth of Hell,
All that was left of them—
Left of six hundred."

A few days afterwards, on the 5th of November, the terrible victory of Inkermann was won at a still greater sacrifice of the flower of the finest army which ever left the British shores, with the brightest hope of military renown. Then followed, in rapid succession, the inglorious return of the Armada from the Baltic, and the heart-rending news of the disasters in the Crimea, which incredible mismanagement and the Czar's fearful ally, the Russian winter, brought upon that noble army, and reduced it to a few spectral figures—to the deepest humiliation of the pride of England. Alas, she had boasted too much of her own strength, and too lightly forgotten the tragedy of Moscow, and the destruction of the great army of the greatest captain on the snow fields of Russia.

I could, of course, not foresee at that time these unexpected reverses of fortune, from which, however, our sister nation soon afterwards recovered. But when I returned with my kind friends to their happy home and cheerful fireside, winding our way through a wilderness of carriages, and looked back, for the last time, to the fairy Palace, I asked myself the question, How long will this magnificent structure stand, a microcosmos of nature and of history,

and the proudest monument of the wealth and genius of the mighty ruler of the world? And I was overpowered with the feeling of the vanity of all earthly beauty and glory. The temples of Thebes, Baalbec and Palmyra have crumbled to dust; the palaces of Nineveh and Babylon lie buried in the ground; Diana's sacred shrine at Ephesus, one of the seven wonders of the world, is the habitation of owls and serpents; the Parthenon, once the fit abode of the goddess of wisdom, the "blue-eyed maid of heaven," has become a prey to wasting war and flame, to paltry antiquarians and high-born robbers; and the imperial Rome, the "lonely mother of dead empires," in the language of a British lord and bard:

> "The Niobe of nations—there she stands,
> Childless and crownless, in her voiceless woe;
> An empty urn within her withered hands,
> Whose holy dust was scattered long ago,"

And will not the time come when the Crystal Palace, like the Coliseum, shall be a shapeless pile of ruins, Syddenham a graveyard of departed glory, and when—to use the words of England's eloquent historian—"some traveler from New Zealand shall, in the midst of a vast solitude, take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's?" Yea, all flesh is grass, and all the glory of the flesh as the flower of the grass, which flourisheth to-day and withereth to-morrow.

> "The cloud-capped towers, the gorgeous palaces,
> The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
> Yea, all which it inherits, shall dissolve,
> And like the baseless fabric of a vision,
> Leave not a wreck behind!"

But while these melancholy thoughts depressed my mind, I lifted up my eyes in faith and hope to heaven, and I saw a structure not made with human hands, fairer and brighter than the Crystal Palace—adorned with richer treasures and enduring monuments of faith and love—resounding with nobler strains of music, the hallelujahs of angels and archangels, of martyrs and saints of all nations and tongues—subject to no ravages of time—unchangeable and eternal as its builder,—the heavenly city, where the weary pilgrim of Zion will find his true home and everlasting rest.

P. S.

Art. IX.—EULOGY ON DOCTOR RAUCH.

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

Soon after the consolidation of Marshall College and Franklin College, in the Spring of 1853, the Alumni Association discussed the question of the removal of the remains of Doctor Rauch from Mercersburg to Lancaster, and in July, 1855, took the following action:

Whereas, since the removal of Marshall College to Lancaster and the sale of the College property at Mercersburg, the remains of the venerated Dr. Rauch, the first President of Marshall College, lie alone, and are liable to exposure and abuse; and

Whereas, it is proper that these honored remains should lie near the spot to be occupied by the new College edifice; and finally,

Whereas, the relatives of the deceased President, have, upon consultation, acquiesced in any proper measure, which may be devised for the removal and suitable consignment of his remains; therefore

Resolved, That a committee of three be appointed to propose some suitable action in the case.

Rev. Dr. Bomberger, Dr. Mayburry and Geo. W. Brewer, Esq., were appointed the committee and reported as follows:

That, in every view of the case, it seems proper that the remains of the first and honored President of our Collegiate Institution should repose under the shadow of the College itself and be under its immediate guardianship. The presence of his tomb and a suitable monument over it, would be an abiding memento of his virtues and excellence, and render the new College grounds more precious in the eyes of the older Alumni. We recommend the following action:

1. That application be made to the Board of Trustees of Franklin and Marshall College for a suitable piece of ground to be occupied for the purpose above named, and for their cooperation in the matter.

2. That a committee of five be appointed to collect the necessary means for the proposed removal and the erection of a monument. And that this committee be authorized to superintend the removal, and the erection of a monument so soon as they have the requisite means at command.

A committee was accordingly appointed by the Alumni Association, consisting of Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., Rev.

M. Kieffer, D. D., Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D., Rev. G. H. Martin, and Rev. G. W. Williard. At a subsequent meeting this committee was reconstructed. It is now composed of nine members, namely, Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D. D., Rev. M. Kieffer, D. D., Rev. E. V. Gerhart, D. D,, Rev. S. H. Reid, Jacob Heyser, Esq , James L. Reynolds, Esq., Rev. Prof. Theodore Appel, Hon. John Cessna, Hon. John W. Killinger.

In accordance with these instructions the application was made to the Board of Trustees in July, 1856. The Board responded cordially to the request, instructing the Executive Committee to purchase a lot of ground in the Lancaster Cemetery and have the remains of Doctor Rauch removed and interred. The Executive Committee acted promptly; but the purchase of the lot was embarrassed and delayed by some previous financial transactions between the College Board and the Cemetery; so that a deed for the lot was not obtained until the Spring of 1858; and the removal of the remains was in consequence deferred until the ensuing winter.

In pursuance of these arrangements, Rev. E. V. Gerhart, a member of the Committee, repaired to Mercersburg and superintended the exhuming of the remains on Tuesday, the first of last March. In performing this work it became apparent with what consideration the deceased had been buried. The coffin, enclosed in a heavy box, was laid upon a flooring of brick, and covered by a strong, well-built arch; the grave was then filled up to the surface with brick laid in mortar, no ground whatever having been used. After removing the arch, the lid of the box was found to be firm; and the coffin itself in a very good state of preservation. By means of ropes the coffin was raised entire, containing the remains untouched and undisturbed; then put into a new coffin-shaped box, and thus transported to Lancaster. The committee have great pleasure in saying that the exhumation proceeded from beginning to end without any occurrences which were inconsistent with the solemnity of the occasion, or in violation of the sense of respect due the ashes of the beloved and honored dead.

At Lancaster the remains were deposited in the first German Reformed church until the day of burial. A new coffin was ordered just large enough to contain the old one.

The funeral ceremonies took place on Tuesday, the 8th of March, at 10 o'clock; the services being held in the German

Reformed church. Whilst the sacred remains, borne by Hon. A. L. Hayes, Emanuel C. Reigart, Esq., Dr. F. A. Muhlenberg, Prof. Wm. M. Nevin, Hon. B. Champneys, Dr. J. L. Atlee, Hon. H. G. Long and Rev. Henry Harbaugh, (several of whom had been personal acquaintances of the deceased,) were carried along the aisle and placed before the altar, the choir in a subdued and mellow tone chanted the introductory sentences of the burial service: "I am the resurrection and the life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." Prof Appel offered the Invocation, and announced the hymn commencing: "Hark! what the voice from heaven proclaims"—the same hymn that was sung in the house of Dr. Rauch at Mercersburg on the sad day of his burial. Rev. G. F. Krotel read 1 Cor. 15: 12–58, and the prayer was offered by Rev. Dr. B. C. Wolff. Then followed the eulogy on the life and character of Dr. Rauch, by his friend and colleague, Rev. Dr. J. W. Nevin. From him alone who knew the deceased so well, who shared so intimately his joys and sorrows, his hopes and fears, could come this beautiful tribute to his memory, breathing a touching tenderness in every sentence. A deep, solemn silence pervaded the congregation; and the precious memories of the past moved to silent tears of affection the Professors, the students, and others, as the venerable orator called them to life again around those illustrious remains.

After the eulogy, Prof. T. C. Porter offered the Lord's Prayer; and the services in the church were concluded by the choir singing the Hymn of Simeon: "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, according to Thy word." The audience now formed into procession, composed of the clergy and many prominent citizens, members of the Board of Trustees, the Faculty, and students of the College, and followed the remains to the Cemetery, where the burial services were conducted by the Rev. E. V. Gerhart. *Requiescat in pace.*

Earth to earth, dust to dust, ashes to ashes; but we wait in hope, looking for the general resurrection in the last day and the life of the world to come, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

E. V. G.

Lancaster, Pa., June 4th, 1859.

EULOGY.

We have before us to day, my Christian friends, inclosed in that quiet coffin, the remains of the first President of Marshall College, Dr. Frederick Augustus Rauch. His death took place at Mercersburg, on the morning of the second day of March, 1841, now eighteen years ago. He was buried on the fourth of March, with large funeral attendance, in the corner of a retired grove belonging to the College grounds, which was then first set apart for cemetery purposes. It was a bright, sunny day; in notable contrast, I remember, with an uncommonly rough storm of snow toward the close of the same week; a day, which was made memorable for the nation at large, by the inauguration of Gen. Harrison as President of the United States—a most brilliant political occasion, destined to be itself dismally overclouded, a very short time afterwards, by the mournful intelligence of his death.

It seems like a dream now, that whole time—so near at hand for memory in one view, and yet in another already so far away. Called up by the presence of these venerated relics, the image of the man is again before me, as I knew him so well, and loved him, during the last sad year of his life. His head prematurely bald; his broad, intellectual brow; his mild, German eye; his generous transparent, deeply sympathetic face; all are before me once more, in vivid picture, as I used to meet him in the intercourse of daily life. The inborn delicacy of his spirit, the earnest enthusiasm of his character, his keen gentlemanly sensibilities, his absolutely irritable impatience of all that was dishonorable and mean, return upon me now like the music of Ossian, mournful and yet pleasant to the soul. I see him in the college chapel, his whole soul beaming from his countenance, in the midst of the students, who were so largely the object of his pride and love. I see him in his study, surrounded with his full shelves of choice German

books—the works of Kant, Jacobi, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schleiermacher, Daub, and the later standard writers generally on Psychology and Ethics—all of the best editions, and done up in the handsomest style of binding; as though he would have considered it a kind of desecration to have them about him under any meaner form; discoursing of his own literary purposes and plans, and wrestling with the sense of disease in the vain hope of being able to carry them into effect. I see him in the bosom of his family; the centre of all kindly affections, the soul of all generous hospitality, actualizing, as it might seem, in his relations to his own *Phebe*, the full sense of what he has so beautifully described as the true ideal of marriage, in his Psychology. I see him, as I looked with apprehension upon his pale face the last time I saw him alive; when in reply to my suggestion, that he ought not to trouble himself with speculation now, but should give himself rather to the simplest, childlike exercises of faith, he said in substance promptly: "That is just what I am trying to do—I have no power for anything else." I see him, as when shocked with the sudden intelligence of his decease, (for he went off at last with scarcely a minute's warning,) and having made my way over to the chamber where he lay, with no one present but his wife, I gazed upon his lifeless form, and could but turn me to the wall and weep aloud, in sympathy with *her* then silent and almost tearless grief. I see him, as two days after he lay with snow white shroud, serenely tranquil, in the unclosed coffin—his countenance like the sculptured image of some Grecian sage—while all around him, in the house of mourning, preparations were going forward to bear him to the silent grave.

All these things appear "but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night." And yet it is now near a score of years, since that solemn funeral took place. During that period, what great changes have gone forward in the world, in the land, and more particularly in the whole circle of interests with which Dr. Rauch stood connected at the time of his death. His wife has followed

him long since into the spirit world. His intimate friend and colleague, the amiable and accomplished Professor Samuel W. Budd—whose slender form and gentle spirit, the unpretending shrine of so much sterling dignity and worth, I have before me too in full vision at the present time, evoked by the power of the occasion—is numbered also with the congregation of the dead. His kind and devoted physician, Dr. Little, Secretary for years of the Board of Trustees for Marshall College, has passed away, with nearly all his interesting and pleasant family. More than a fourth part of the graduates of the first five classes of the institution from 1837 to 1841, count on its catalogue now as deceased. May we not say indeed, that Mercersburg itself, as he knew it, has in great part passed away. In the midst of these changes, the College too has had its eventful history—one which it was not easy to foresee or anticipate at that time. What the end of it has been, we all know. A few years since, it was considered necessary to translate it to this place; where it now flourishes, under a new act of incorporation, in full view of the city and the whole surrounding country, with the promise of a bright future before it, bearing the auspicious title of Franklin and Marshall College.

In view of his close connection with the early history of the institution, and the relation he holds to its original and properly distinguishing genius and spirit, it has been felt all along that the remains of Dr. Rauch ought to follow its removal to Lancaster. The Alumni of the College have generously offered, in that case, to erect over his grave a new monument, more worthy of his memory than the solid obelisk which was to be left behind in Mercersburg—and which is now placed there, with great propriety certainly, in front of the new German Reformed church. To meet this proposition, the Trustees of Franklin and Marshall College have procured a proper plot of ground in the cemetery on the North East side of the town, and by their order the remains are now brought on, for the purpose of being deposited there with suitable solemnities at this time.

It has seemed proper, that something should be said, in connection with the occasion, concerning the life and character of the man; with the view of introducing him as it were publicly to the knowledge and consideration of the community, with which he is to be joined from this time forward in the solemn fellowship of the grave. Few who are here to-day ever saw Dr. Rauch; and although many among us, no doubt, have heard his name mentioned with honor as the first President of Marshall College, the number is still small, we may presume, who can be said to know much of his actual history. It is altogether fit and right, therefore, that the attention of the people of Lancaster should be called in this public manner to the distinguished stranger, whose presence—still speaking, though dead—is to become from this time forward, may we not say, one of the monumental honors of the place. The bones which lie in that coffin ought not to be hurried to their new sepulchre, without some due recognition among us of their more than common sacredness and worth. They are the bones of a great and a good man. Let them be honored with all pious veneration accordingly.

Dr. Rauch was born at Kirchbracht, in Hesse-Darmstadt, July 27, 1806. He lost his mother in infancy. His father was still living at the time of his death, in firm and vigorous health, a respectable clergyman, settled in the vicinity of Frankford on the Maine. Before the "Union," as it is called, took place between the two Confessions, he was attached to the Reformed Church. His son always spoke of him with reverence and affection, as a seriously pious man.

At the age of eighteen, the son became a student at the University of Marburg, where he took his diploma in the year 1827. After this he prosecuted his studies for a year at Giessen. For a time, he was employed as an assistant in teaching by an uncle, who had charge of a literary institution in Frankford. Another year he spent, as a student again, at Heidelberg.

Here he came under the special influence of the distinguished philosopher and theologian, *Charles Daub;* a rela-

tion, which seems to have formed a memorable epoch in the history of his inward life, determining to no small extent its whole subsequent order and form. Dr. Rauch always cherished the highest veneration for this great man, and looked back, with fond recollection, upon the year spent at Heidelberg, under the light of his instructions, and in contact with the living power of his spirit, as in some respects the most interesting and important part of his education.

Daub, we are told, had an admirable faculty for drawing out the powers of generous. minded young men, and inspiring them with great and noble sentiments. He knew how to shatter to pieces wisely their presumptuous imaginations on the one hand; and how to encourage and support their efforts on the other, by giving them proper play, and meeting them at the right time with a warm and manly sympathy. Knowledge with him was not only deep, but full of life. In his person, the most profound speculations became instinct with living breath, and assumed the freshness of actual, concrete existence. In the lecture room, he seemed to be perfectly pervaded with his subject; so that it might be said to utter itself in every tone, look, and gesture. And yet there was nothing rhetorical or declamatory, in the representation. Thought made itself objective in his person. The whole man wrought in sympathy with his theme, no matter how abstract, so that the idea of self appeared to fall out of view entirely. Not unfrequently he would step down from the desk in which he lectured altogether, as though it were too narrow for his thoughts and feelings, uttering himself in tones of earnestness that would sometimes thrill his auditors with a sensation of awe, as being scarce earthly in their character. Such was he in his lecture room. Where the student stood near to him in the intimacies of private life, he came more fully still under the power of the same plastic influence. The sphere in which his spirit moved habitually was full of earnestness and moral force. One could wish indeed it had been pervaded by more of the positive element of ho-

liness, such as breathes the atmosphere of heaven, in thoughts and desires flowing actively out toward Christ. But it is difficult to estimate fairly the religious character of one, whose whole position and circumstances were so widely different from our own. Standing where he did, in the midst of abounding unbelief, and called as he was to wrestle with all sorts of skeptical difficulty in his own profoundly speculative mind, his faithfulness to the cause of Christianity may well command our admiration and respect. He was a man who lived for the invisible and the eternal, and on whose soul the visions of the Almighty, in the person of Jesus Christ, had unfolded their glory. His wish was to die, as he expressed it, on the cathedra or desk, in the midst of his professional work. And so it happened in fact. While engaged in lecturing, he was called away suddenly, A. D. 1836, in the seventy-first year of his age.

Dr. Rauch was fitted in his whole nature, to receive a deep and lasting impression from the spirit of such a man. The time when he came within the sphere of his influence was favorable to this result. He had finished his academical course, and taken his degree; and was beginning to have some knowledge of the world in the way of actual experience. Life was coming to clothe itself in some measure with its proper seriousness, in opposition to the visionary dreams of mere youth. His mind at the same time was vigorously active, and the way was fully open, by the advantages of previous education, for its free commerce with truth. In these circumstances, he was not only introduced into Daub's lecture room, but admitted also to the innermost circle of his discipleship. The aged hierophant in the temple of knowledge fixed his eye upon him with friendly interest, took him encouragingly by the hand, and became his companion as well as guide in philosophical thinking and study. The authority which the teacher thus gained over the mind of his pupil was of the highest kind, and such as could not be destroyed by distance or time. Dr. Rauch took a pleasure in speaking of what he owed to his venerable instructor in the way of

knowledge. But this was not the whole of his obligation. It included also an important spiritual benefit. He felt that he had been morally invigorated by coming within the range of his influence. It proved a powerful help to his faith. How far his religious views, as they had existed previously to this time, may have needed reformation, or how far the influence under which he was now brought operated to produce a direct and specific change, I am not prepared to say. Probably there was no direct revolution, to any extent, accomplished in the case. Whatever latitudinarianism our youthful theologian may have been chargeable with before, it is not likely that it was distinctly defined and settled even for his own thoughts. It was merely the general disease of the country, which attached itself almost necessarily at the time to a university education, poisoning the mind of the student, sometimes more and sometimes less. Nor was it fully eradicated in Dr. Rauch's case, it would seem, even during his stay at Heidelberg. But a new turn was given to his mind. His confidence in the great fundamental truths of Christianity was confirmed. A wholesome tendency was implanted in his religious views and feelings. And more still, productive ideas, the seeds of living thought, were introduced into the soil of his spirit, which, favored by other influences subsequently, germinated and brought forth fruit, after their kind, in thoughts both sound and thorough with regard to religion generally. Under this view it was probably, rather than in reference to any direct change in himself, that Dr. Rauch seemed to look upon Daub in the light almost of a spiritual father.

It speaks much for his character, that such a man as Daub should have honored him, as he seems to have done, with his special notice and favor. He admitted him to the most free and familiar intercourse, and regarded him evidently with more than common interest, as one who might be expected to bear in no small part afterwards the mantle of his own spirit.

On leaving Heidelberg, Dr. Rauch became extraordina-

ry professor, as it is called, in the University of Giessen, being at the time in the 24th year of his age. In the German Universities, the professors are of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary, both alike appointed by government, but differing in rank and salary. The ordinary professors compose the proper faculty, and are entitled to its privileges. The professors extraordinary are simply teachers, and have no farther duties or privileges. They are to be considered as candidates for the other station. Their position is valued mainly as a stepping stone to preferment. It gives a young man a certain rank and standing in the University ; shows that he has enjoyed the notice of government; and authorises him to calculate on further promotion, if he continue faithful to himself. This, however, does not take place as a matter of course. If a professor extraordinary allow himself to sit down satisfied with his attainments, as a scholar, he may remain extraordinary professor, all his life. In many cases, a number of years elapse, before the wished for promotion is reached. It is of course complimentary to the character and standing of the candidate, when he is carried rapidly forward from this position to an ordinary profesorship. This compliment was enjoyed by Dr. Rauch. At the end of a year spent at Giessen, under the appointment which has been mentioned, he received an invitation to Heidelberg as ordinary professor. His fair prospects however, and the high hopes with which his bosom had been filled in view of them, were here suddenly blasted, as it seemed, forever.

In some public exercise at Giessen, he was led to utter his mind too freely, on the subject of government. The precise point in which he offended, is not known. The whole affair was one, to which he never liked to refer subsequently ; and few among his friends in this country knew at all, that any political difficulty had made it necessary for him to leave his native land. He always charged himself, it is believed, with some imprudence in the case, and never affected to make a merit of it, as he might easily have done in this country, and as most other foreigners proba-

bly in similar circumstances would have had no hesitation in doing. Those who were familar with Dr. Rauch and who know how easy a thing it is to wake the jealousy of European governments, where the subject of human rights comes at all into consideration, will not be disposed to surmise after all any thing *very* dreadful in the freedom of speech, into which he fell on this occasion. Such as it was, however, it drew upon him the sharp displeasure of the powers above him ; and it became necessary for him finally, in the judgment of his friends, to provide for his own safety by a voluntary self-expatriation. His departure was sudden. He had time to make only a hurried visit to his father, between the hours of eleven and one at night; when he bade him a sorrowful adieu, and turned his face toward the broad Atlantic, an emigrant, bound for a new trial of the world in the far-off West. It was not the love of wandering, nor the visions of a romantic fancy, nor any particular zeal he felt for our republican institutions as such, which brought him to exchange Germany for America. He was ardently attached to his fatherland, and had every reason to be satisfied there with his circumstances and prospects. It must have been with an immense sacrifice of feeling, that he found himself compelled to abandon all, and become a stranger in a foreign land.

He came to this country in the fall of 1831, having completed the 25th year of his age. His first year was spent at Easton, in this State, where he applied himself diligently and with great success to the cultivation of the English language. Here he was made to feel the heavy disabilities of a foreigner, whose speech and former education both conspire to isolate his existence, in the midst of the community to which he belongs. His German itself, even in the midst of a German settlement, was not of a character to open the way for him at once to any public service ; being materially different from the same language, as usually spoken in this country. He had made up his mind, however, not to give way to difficulties or discouragements ; and wisely set himself to understand and enter into the

modes of thinking with which he was surrounded, instead of fretting and quarreling as foreigners sometimes do, with what might not be according to his mind, as though he could expect the world to bend for his accommodation, rather than that he should bend himself. His knowledge of music here stood him in more stead at first, than his knowledge of philosophy, or his acquaintance with Latin and Greek. He excelled in this art, practically, as well as theoretically, thanks to his German education; and to procure himself an independent support, did not hesitate to give lessons on the piano. This, let it be remembered, instead of occupying the high position of a professor, the associate and colleague of Charles Daub, in the University of Heidelberg. So much for meddling with politics rashly, in the neighborhood of the sunny Rhine!

His excellent spirit, joined to his general cultivation, soon won him friends. Though short, his sojourn in Easton brought him into connections and relations, which had the effect in some measure of causing him to feel at home in the land of his exile, and to which he always referred afterwards with fond and affectionate interest.

In June, 1832, he went to York; having received an appointment to take the charge of a classical school, in connection with the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Synod, which was then rising into importance in that place under the care of the late Dr. Mayer. Here he continued, diligently employed in teaching, till the autumn of 1835. The amount of labor which he performed during this time was very great.

In the fall of 1832 he was ordained by the Synod, at York, to the office of the holy ministry.

In the year 1833, he became united in marriage with a daughter of Mr. Laomi Moore, of Morristown, in New Jersey. Of this lady it is sufficient to say here, that she was in all respects worthy to be the wife of such a man.

In the fall of 1835, he removed to Mercersburg. The classical school connected with the Seminary was now in the way of being erected into a College, and both institu-

tions were to become located, permanently, as it was supposed, in that place. Such was the origin of Marshall College. Dr. Rauch was at once invited to take charge of it as President; being allowed to retain, at the same time, the connection into which he had been brought before this with the Theological Seminary, as Professor of Biblical Literature. In this responsible position he continued faithfully and zealously laboring, in the midst of many difficulties and discouragements, till the time of his decease.

For more than a year previous to this event, his health had been in a precarious state; his nervous system shattered; his strength in a great measure gone. He still persisted, however, in his academical engagements, and other literary employments; looking upon mental exercise as medicinal in his case, rather than hurtful, and as being indispensable indeed to the proper elasticity and tone of his being. This idea might have been correct, within certain limits; but he carried it, no doubt, altogether too far. Had he abandoned his studies entirely for a time, and given himself to travelling and recreation, his health in all probability would have been restored, and his life preserved. Even as it was, his case seemed in the winter to have fairly weathered its crisis, and to be in the full progress of recovery, when a catarrhal fever, epidemic in February, fell upon his exhausted frame, and reduced him lower than ever. His dissolution took place a shore time after.

My own personal acquaintance with him commenced only one year before the close of his life, when I was called to be his colleague in the Theological Seminary. I had some knowledge previously of his general standing, but no particular information with regard to his character and spirit. Intimately associated as I was to be with him in professional life, I had of course felt some anxiety in relation to this point; a feeling for which there seemed to be the more reason, as it was understood that serious difficulties had already actually occurred in the official connections of Dr. Rauch, in the case of which a large share of

blame was supposed by many to rest properly on his shoulders. All anxiety of this sort, however, fled from my spirit in a very short time, when I came to know the man himself. I found myself attracted to him from the start. His countenance was the index of his heart, open, generous, and pure, I soon felt that my relations with him were likely to be both pleasant and safe. Farther acquaintance only served to strengthen and confirm this first impression. It was clear to me that he had been misunderstood and wronged. He was one of the last men certainly who might be supposed capable of dishonorable conduct in any way. Then I perceived very soon also, that his learning and intellectual power were of a higher order altogether than I had before felt authorized to expect; although it was not until the appearance of his *Psychology*, that I learned myself to place him sufficiently high in this respect. Here again it became clear to me that his proper worth had not been rightly understood; and I could not but look upon it as a strange and interesting fact, that the infant College of the German Reformed Church should have had placed at its head, there in Mercersburg—without care, or calculation, or consciousness even on the part of its friends generally—one of the very first minds of Germany, which under other circumstances might well have been counted an ornament and honor to the oldest institution in the land.

As a scholar, Dr. Rauch excelled particularly in Classical Literature, in Natural History, in Moral Philosophy, and in Mental Science. He was at home also in the sphere of Aesthetics, and had his mind richly stored with the creations of genius as they belong to the fine arts generally. The German Philosophy, with all its bewildering abstractions, was for him the subject of full, familiar knowledge; while it commanded also his general confidence and respect. He saw in its different cardinal systems not contradiction and confusion so much, as the unity of one and the same grand intellectual movement, borne

forward still from one stage of development to another. Of course, in this view, he placed a special value on the philosophy of Hegel—the culmination of the process—although he was very far from surrendering himself blindly to his authority. It was his belief, that Hegel's philosophy, in spite of all the bad use which had been made of it, had wrought a real reform in the whole world of mind; especially in rightly defining the objects and proper bounds of the different sciences, and in settling the general method by which they should be cultivated.

In these circumstances he found himself impelled, to attempt the work of transferring to some extent into the literature of this country—not Hegel's philosophy as such, nor the metaphysics of Germany as a distinct and separate interest—but the life and power of German thinking generally, under its more recent forms, in all that relates to the phenomenology of the soul. For this task, he was eminently qualified—beyond all other scholars probably belonging to our land. He was at home in the philosophy of Great Britain, as well as in that of Germany, and knew accurately the points of contact and divergency by which the relations of the two systems of thought to one another, generally considered, are characterized. By a ten year's residence on this side of the Atlantic, he had become fairly domiciliated in American modes of thinking and feeling, without being divested of the intellectual habit which belonged to him as a German; an immense advantage, as compared with the position of those, who look at either of these systems of life externally only, from the bosom of the other, and *so* attempt to bring them together. Not only was Dr. Rauch familiar with American life and thought, but he had come to identify himself completely with us as a people. He had ceased to look upon himself as a foreigner, and had no sympathy with the morbid feeling, which leads some to isolate themselves through life in a strange land, by clinging in their own consciousness continually to the thought of themselves under this view, so as to *force* the same thought on those with whom they are surround-

ed. He loved this country, though brought into it originally, it may be said, against his own inclination, and had no disposition to exchange it again for Europe. He knew how to appreciate our political institutions, as compared with those of the old world. Our practical spirit was honored by him with due regard, and had confessedly wrought a partial modification in his own views of truth and life. Thus was he fitted to negotiate understandingly and faithfully, between the two interests, in the midst of which he stood. He knew that a simple transfer of German thoughts into English forms of expression, was not what the interests of learning require in this country ; but that it is only by being reproduced in new creations, from a mind transfused with their inward power and at the same time at home in the American element of thought, that they can be expected to become truly and permanently valuable. The idea of such a reproduction of the moral wealth of Germany, under forms intelligible and safe, in the sphere of our American philosophy, may be considered perhaps the favorite dream of Dr. Rauch's life. It animated him in his work, as a teacher. It stimulated his zeal as a writer.

His work on *Psychology*, published the summer before his death, was only the beginning of what he had it in contemplation to attempt, for the interests of literature, in this way.

Much more important, in his own judgment, was to have been his *Christian Ethics*. The Psychology was regarded as preparatory and introductory to this, and was shaped with reference to it more or less from beginning to end. He had in his mind a general system, which required the one work to be followed by the other, in order that the whole might appear in its true light. And then to make the conception still more complete, the Moral Philosophy was to be itself succeeded again by a treatise on Aesthetics. It was only when all should be brought out, that he expected the true character of the primary work to be fully seen.

On the Moral Philosophy especially his heart was most

earnestly set. He seemed to feel within himself the urgency of a special call, to bestow upon our literature something more worthy of the great subject than the unscientific systems, commonly current in this country under its name. As he had been lecturing upon it for years, he was prepared to bring his matter into a suitable form for the press, with very little delay; and proposed to make a beginning with it the very week in which he was compelled to take his bed, hoping to get the work out in the course of the ensuing summer. For months previously, the plan of the work had been before him in all its details, till the whole seemed to be brought to the most complete and satisfactory conception, like the ideal which fills the thoughts of the painter or sculptor, when a true creation is about to be produced by either in the form of art.

It may not be out of place to quote here, in regard to this subject, part of a letter which he wrote to me some months before his death from Saratoga, where he had gone for the benefit of his health. The extract—a translation from the German original—is well suited, not simply to show how he felt on the subject of his proposed work, but to illustrate also the general earnestness and generosity of his nature.

"The most agreeable hope animates me," he says, "that the goodness of the Lord will again restore me to health, and give me new strength, to labor in conjunction with yourself, my dear friend, for a great and noble object. To this object I wish to devote what remains of my life, that I may depart hence in the end as a true servant of the Lord. My *Christian Ethics* have occupied me very pleasantly on my whole journey. The plan of the work lies now before me, the whole with all its connections and parts, clear and distinct, like a transparent crystal. All the transitions show themselves plainly; so that if I were able, as a painter, to present the whole in outward picture, it would appear to all, not as a *composition*, but as a living organism, which being animated with a single idea throws off whatever does not belong to it by its own life. The

thought that it has fallen to my lot, by divine direction as it would seem, to offer as a present to the literature of this country some portion of what the noble German mind has produced in the sphere of ideas, lifts me up and imparts to my being a value not previously known. In all, however, I never lose sight of the relation in which I have come to stand to you, as that in which alone my enterprises seem to prosper. Single and solitary no man can accomplish anything; only in communion with others, of kindred spirit with himself, can the good at which he aims be reached. One needs to be kept from the painful sense of standing alone ; a living intercourse with others, and the exchange of ideas, are required to give ripeness to one's own thoughts. And here let me be allowed in truth and sincerity to say, how greatly my conversations with you have instructed and encouraged me, and how deeply I feel that our association will work to advance in the best manner the great interest to whose service we are called." Referring afterwards to another point, he writes: "It is manifest that the Lord is with us. If we remain true to him, he will not forsake either us or our important work. Is it his work, and are we his servants? Why then should we be discouraged or of weak faith?"

Thus ardent was he in the prosecution of the favorite interest of his life. Through all his sickness, he flattered himself with the hope of being restored to health ; not so much it seemed, out of any undue regard to life for its own sake, as because he felt that he had it in his power to be useful in the sphere in which he had been called to work. Life, he would say, appeared to him to be something unspeakably poor in any other view. Nor was it, as he thought, with any improper reference to his own reputation, that he was so anxious to execute the design with which his soul was filled. He attached a high importance to his work on its own account, and could not rest easily under the thought of its not being accomplished. The idea that his sickness might be unto death, instead of drawing off his mind from the task he had in hand, served only

to make him more anxious to get his new work ready for the press. When it was suggested to him, shortly before he took his bed, that it would be perhaps better for him to defer entering upon this labor for a time, his quick reply was: "Why, I might die, before it was done." It appeared that he would care less about dying, if only this object were reached. As it was, however, with all his wish to live, he declared himself ready to acquiesce in the will of God, if it should lead to a different result.

Dr. Rauch was admirably qualified for the office he filled, as an instructor of young men. His resources for the communication of knowledge, were unusually extensive, and his powers were altogether happily balanced and adjusted with regard to one another. His imagination especially was rich, and well stored with materials gathered from the universe of nature and art, under its ancient as well as its more modern forms. Then he carried his whole soul into his work. The business of teaching with him, was any thing but mechanical or formal. His nature was ardent, generous, enthusiastic; and towards the young especially, standing to him in the relation of pupils, it uttered itself with the most affectionate earnestness and vivacity. His whole intercourse with his students besides, was adapted to win their confidence and engage their love. There was no magisterial stiffness in his manners; but on the contrary the greatest freedom and urbanity. The student was made to feel that his preceptor was his friend, and could scarcely fail to reciprocate the kindness, which seemed to form the very element of the relation on his part. Few, it is believed, have been under Dr. Rauch's instructions for any time, without finding a strong sentiment of love combined in their bosoms with the feeling of respect, toward his person. And well his students might love him; for he looked upon them as his own family.

The College altogether, it may be said, was dear to him as the apple of his eye. His fondest wishes and brightest expectations with regard to life, clustered here, as around their true and proper centre. His ambition coveted no

higher honor for this world, than that of building up Marshall College, and rendering it, by the blessing of God, an ornament to the State, and the glory of the Church under whose auspices particularly, it has been established.

His social qualities were of the first order. He might be said to have been formed constitutionally, for friendship and affection. No man could be more kind and tender in the bosom of his own family, or more fully alive to the claims of domestic love. With his friends generally, he was open-hearted and confiding to an uncommon degree. His confidence was easily won, and where it found anything to rest upon soon became full and warm. It might be said indeed, that he was almost too ready to place himself in the power of others in this way. Suspicion was not the habit of his soul. He had no art nor cunning; no tact for diplomatic management; no capacity for intrigue; no aptness for reaching his ends by circles and curves. The want of this talent, joined with a certain irritable quality of his nature, operated at times to place him in a somewhat unpopular light. His feelings rose too readily to the surface, his heart leaped too quickly, if not into his tongue, at least into his tones and looks, to allow proper graciousness always toward those with whom he found reason to be dissatisfied. The want of art made him awkward at times, if not absolutely uncourteous, where others might show themselves bland and smooth.

His spirit was characteristically generous and noble. He shrank, with a nice instinctive sensibility, from all that is narrow and mean, as well as from all that might be considered low and gross. He could never condescend to graduate the value of life by any merely outward or material scale. Truth was more to him than gold; wisdom more excellent than rubies. The sense of the useful—the organ for calculating worldly profit and gain—was less active with him by far, than the sense of the beautiful and good.

The religious views of Dr. Rauch were eminently spiritual. In using this term, however, I do not refer so much

to the habit of his mind in a strictly devotional view, as to its sympathy with the invisible and the eternal in general. His orthodoxy did not rest in the dead letter; but neither did it stop, where the fancied superior illumination of some who affect to despise the letter is found stopping, in mere intellectual speculation. This he considered to be the essence of rationalism and neology; and because it seemed to him that much of our American divinity rested upon no deeper ground than this, he held it to be in principle unsafe, as needing only a change of circumstances to be seen vanishing ultimately into thin air. Knowledge could be real here, it appeared to him, only in the form of life. Faith must embrace, not the notion of supernatural things simply, but the very power and presence of the things themselves. Religion became for him in this view an inward commerce with the powers of a higher spiritual world. The invisible was felt to be the truly actual and real, while the outward and visible might be regarded as being in some sort only its empty shadow projected on the field of space. Innumerable analogies, adumbrations, and correspondencies, not obvious to common minds, seemed habitually present to his view, binding the universe into one sublime whole, the earth reflecting the heavens, and the waves of eternity echoing on the shores of time. There was perhaps, in this respect, a dash of mysticism in his constitution. But if such a habit *be* mysticism, it may be questioned whether it be after all so bad a thing as is sometimes imagined. Our philosophy and religion would both gain something probably, if they looked less to the outward and more to the inward in this way. Olshausen was Dr. Rauch's favorite commentator on the Scriptures; and he is counted commonly to be somewhat mystical. But what spiritually healthful man would exchange the fulness of fresh breathing life with which he is here met, for the cold exegesis of a Grotius or a Macknight?

Such, in his life and general character, was the first President of Marshall College. The institution, it was felt at the time, sustained an immense loss in his death. His life

appeared to have been altogether too short for his proper work. Yet it can not be said of him, that he lived in vain.

He has left behind him a lasting monument in his work on Psychology. This, of course, is not without its defects. When can we expect to have a book on the same subject, that shall be all that a just criticism may require? Some of its Hegelian aspects are, to say the least, a good deal unsatisfactory. It must be admitted too, that it is not just in the right form, to answer the purposes of a text book in the common American sense. But still, with all these concessions, we hazard nothing in pronouncing it one of the most important publications in its department which has yet appeared in this country. It was the introduction into our literature of a new way of looking at the science of the human mind, a method which was not known among us before. I do not mean by this, that it was in any sense original or new with Dr. Rauch. He never thought of claiming for himself any such credit. The method has been common in Germany for years; all that he pretended to do, was to exhibit it under an English form, working into it in an independent manner, the material which he found at hand in different German writers. His work is based in this way especially on the *Philosophical Anthropology* of Daub, with a proper use at the same time of other recent systems. The true merit of Dr. Rauch in the case is, that he has given us in American shape, not a translation or copy simply of any of these transatlantic systems, but a living reproduction, both in matter and form, of what we may call their general idea. In this view, his Psychology, when it appeared, was something new among us in its kind. It formed in fact a sort of epoch in this department of our literature. We had nothing like it before; and we have had as yet nothing to supersede it properly since.

Another interesting memorial of Dr. Rauch is found in a volume entitled *The Inner Life*, which has been brought out lately by one of his early pupils, the Rev. Dr. Gerhart, now President of Franklin and Marshall College. It con-

sists of seventeen discourses selected from his manuscript sermons, and so arranged as to exhibit to a certain extent the unity and order of a common subject, answering to the title of the book. Written mainly for students, by one who was himself accustomed to think more than to declaim, these discourses are of course not just of the popular order and kind. Some of them approach to the character of philosophico-theological dissertations. They are, however, very far from being either abstract or dry. The grace of an inward, spiritual eloquence may be said to adorn them throughout. They are fresh, earnest, and full of religious life—chaste in style, tender in sentiment, beautiful in description, rich in edifying and suggestive thought. They fairly sparkle with the gems of imagination—taking the faculty in its true sense, as it differs from mere fancy, and forms the proper soil of genius. Altogether the book is well suited to make us acquainted with the inward life of its author, reflecting as a mirror the distinguishing qualities of his mind and heart. It is especially important as a standing testimony to his religious character; illustrating the fact, as the editor of the volume tells us, "that the first President of Marshall College was a decided and humble Christian, no less than a philosopher; that his philosophy was neither rationalism nor pantheism, neither sensationalism nor transcendentalism in any false sense, but really Christian; and that the impulse and peculiar character which the institution received from him in the beginning, was not hostile or prejudicial, as some have alleged, to sound Christian ideas, but subservient and favorable to the progress of orthodox scientific theology and true practical religion."

Still more effectually in some sense the life of Dr. Rauch may be regarded as continuing itself in the history of Marshall College, and in the successive classes of students who have gone forth from it year after year, bearing along with them more or less of its spirit into the world. For it is very certain, that the soul and genius of the man, his ideal presence we may say, wrought powerfully on the character

of the institution, during the whole period of its continuance in Mercersburg. His ideas went largely to form the reigning tone of its instructions, and also to determine their general direction. His name became a precious legacy for the College—more highly appreciated after his death than it had been during his life—inspiring those who had the care of it with large and generous views, and at the same time drawing respect to it from abroad. It served as a sort of rallying standard for the academical pride and self-respect of the students. His very grave appeared to hallow the ground to which it belonged; making it sacred to literature under its best form, and in its lonely retirement—a spot for musing meditation, the close of many a summer evening's walk—breathing as it were an atmosphere around it, that made its memory blessed.

The remains now before us, form thus, as we may all see, a most important part of the College itself—one of its chief historical treasures indeed, more valuable than any other portion of its literary apparatus—which ought of right to accompany it in its removal to this place. Without them, the transfer could never be altogether final and complete. Without them, the affections of its alumni could never go wholly after it, so as to settle with full home-like feeling in its new connections and relations. They would continue to linger still with fond recollection around his monument at Mercersburg, as though half the glory of the old institution lay buried there with his slumbering dust. It was a debt due to Franklin and Marshall College, then, to complete at this time the act of consolidation out of which it has grown, by bringing the contents of that honored grave to Lancaster; that being solemnly committed here to a new tomb, and crowned with new marble, they might be outwardly and openly joined henceforward with the living history of the College in its new form. Let the city of Lancaster welcome these illustrious remains. They will be an ornament to her cemetery, a jewel in the coronet of her future fame. Especially let the friends of Franklin

and Marshall College, its Board of Trustees, its Faculty, its Students, take home to themselves with new honor and affection the memory of the man, whose bones are placed this day as a precious legacy in their hands ; and whose grave is to be for them from this time forward their own visible and solemn pledge, may we not say, that they will show themselves true and faithful to the interests of learning, which have been consigned to them in such honorable conjunction as a great public trust. The best wish we can utter in behalf of the institution is, that it may never cease to be known as worthy of the name, and true to the spirit, of its first President, Frederick Augustus Rauch.

Art. X.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Lectures on Metaphysics and Logic. By *Sir William Hamilton*, Bart. (Late) Prof. of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh. Edited by the Rev. *H. L. Mansel*, B. D., Oxford, and *John Veitch*, Edinburgh. In 2 vols. Vol. I. Metaphysics. Boston : Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

This stately volume of 738 pages, is probably the largest metaphysical work ever printed in this country. Its appearance is alike creditable to the enterprise of the publishers and the taste of the American people, who, with all their practical and utilitarian tendencies, are alive to the abstrusest questions of philosophy. These lectures constitute the first portion of the Biennial Course which the great philosopher of Scotland was in the habit of delivering as professor of Logic and Metaphysics in the University of Edinburgh, from 1836 to his recent lamented death. Although not as complete and perfect as if they had been prepared by the author himself, and passing by many of the subjects generally included in Metaphysics or Ontology, even in its stricter sense, they are, nevertheless, a most valuable work and a noble monument of his philosophical genius and learning. Although not so elaborate and exact as some previous works of Hamilton, they surpass them in freshness, vivacity and adaptedness to popular capacity, while they are equal

to them in variety and comprehensiveness of learning, ranging over ancient Greek and Roman, patristic, scholastic, British, French and German schools of speculative science, and commanding them with such facility and ease that we are almost prepared to subscribe to the judgment of his enthusiastic American admirer and critic, Mr. Samuel Tyler: "There seems to be not even a random thought of any value, which has been dropped along any, even obscure, path of mental activity, in any age or country, that his diligence has not recovered, his sagacity appreciated, and his judgment husbanded in the stores of his knowledge."

P. S.

THE LIFE OF JOHN MILTON: narrated in connection with the political, ecclesiastical, and literary History of his time. By *David Masson*, M. A,, Prof. of Eng. Liter. in University College, London. Vol. I. 1608–1639. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

Unquestionably by far the best work ever written on Milton, which promises, when completed in two more volumes, to throw all its predecessors far in the shade. We have indeed a large number of introductory memoirs to some editions of the poet's works, or essays on his character and merits. But Prof. Masson purposes to give a full and elaborate biography of Milton from the cotemporary sources. He views him under all his aspects as a man, a scholar, a Christian, a Puritan, a statesman, as well as a poet, and always in connection with the general movements of his age and country, so as to reflect in his life, at the same time, the history of England during one of its richest and most interesting periods, embracing the last sixteen years of James I., the whole reign of Charles I., the interval of the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, and the first fourteen years of the Restoration under Charles II. The first volume, consisting of 658 large pages, and adorned with two beautiful portraits of Milton, the boy of ten, and the youth of twenty-one—extends only from 1606 to 1639, and accompanies Milton from his birth to the school house, the University of Cambridge, through his early literary and poetical labors, with a full review of the literary, ecclesiastical and political aspects and antecedents of England at the approaching storm of the Puritan Revolution, and through his continental journey extending to Rome and Naples. It is the period of his education and minor poems. The second volume is to embrace the middle period of his life from 1640 to 1660, i. e. from the beginning of the Civil Wars to the Restoration, during which time he unfolded mainly his polemical activity as a prose-writer. The third volume

will be devoted to the last period, from 1661 to 1674, the period of his later muse and the publication of "Paradise Lost"

We await with much interest the conclusion of so elaborate and able a work, which, while doing full justice to the immortal author of the sublimest Christian epic ever written, next to Dante's "Divina Comedia," bids fair to be at the same time an enduring monument of fame to the biographer. The saying attributed to Walter Savage Landor, that a rib of Shakspeare would have sufficed to produce a Milton, and a rib of Milton *all* the poets that have succeeded him, is unjust both to Milton and his successors. But Milton is undoubtedly the greatest poet which the English race, so prolific in poets, ever produced, with the exception of him

> "on whose forehead climb
> The crowns of the world! oh, eyes sublime,
> With tears and laughter for all time!"

In one most important respect Milton is even above the wonderful swan of Avon: he drew his inspirations not from man and nature only, but from the Bible; he devoted his muse to the Saviour; he walked, though blind, like Homer, among the flowers of Paradise; he ventured into the councils of heaven; he conveyed his sublime thoughts in the cathedral music of worship, and stands forth a representative of the sacred harmony between poetry and religion—an incalculable blessing for all generations.

P. S.

Mosaics. By the author of "Salad for the Solitary," etc. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. London: Richard Bentley. 1859.

A curious title for a curious book, gotten up in curious style, with an ornamental mosaic title-page. It is something in the order of Burton's "Anatomy of Melancholy," or of the elder D' Israel's "Curiosities of Literature," a bouquet of choice flowers plucked from many a garden, ancient and modern, of every latitude and longitude, with the appropriate inscription: "We have been at a great feast of languages and have stolen all the scraps." It is a heterogeneous collection of literary excerpts, pleasant passages, smart sayings, suggestive hints, stirring thoughts, and occasional memoranda of much miscellaneous and desultory reading, arranged under the following heads: "Author-Craft;" "Youth and Age;" "The Human Face Divine;" "The Witchery of Wit;" "Single Blessedness;" "Origin of Celebrated Books;" "Night and Day;" "Fame;" "The Magic of Music;" "The Bright Side." Like Montaigue, the author (Mr. Fr. Sanders) has industriously garnered up

"Some odds and ends,
With homely truths, too trite to be sublime;
And many a moral scattered here and there—
Not very new, nor yet the worse for wear."

The religious element is not wanting in this miscellaneous volume. Take the following beautiful tribute to the good old book of books:

"Prince and peasant of every land have been delighted students of its sacred pages. The obligations of the world to the Bible are beyond all enumeration: philosophy has derived its highest truths, and legislation has founded its judicial code alike from its divine ethics; for its lessons are not only the essence of pure religion, but the truest morals and the guiding axioms of political economy. It is the theme of universal appeal—no work being so frequently quoted or referred to. It sustained Origen's scholarship, and Chrysostom's golden rhetoric. It gave life to the revival of letters, and Dante and Petrarch revelled in its imagery. It roused the intrepidity of the lion-hearted Luther, shed supernal grandeur over Milton's mighty mind, and soothed the sadness of Cowper's. It is the magna charta of the world's liberties, and formed the glorious panoply of the heroes of civil and religious rights, and has in great part revolutionized the face of the world."

Altogether we can commend this book of literary mosaic to all authors and men of literary taste who wish to spend a few leisure hours profitably as well as pleasantly. They will not be disappointed.

P. S.

The Art of Extempore Speaking. Hints for the pulpit, the senate, and the bar. By *M. Bautain*, Vicar-General and Professor at the Sorbonne. With additions by a Member of the New York Bar. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street. 1859.

This is the first and only book we have seen on the subject of *extempore* speaking, i. e., speaking from the inspiration of the moment before a specified auditory on a particular occasion, on a given subject, without notes and without formal preparation of thought and arrangement of phrases, yet from the fullness of a well stored mind and earnest heart. The author calls this mode of eloquence "a kind of child-bearing in public," of which the speaker feels all the effort and all the pain, and in which he is assisted by all the sympathy of the hearers, who witness with lively interest this labor of mental life, and receive with pleasure this bantling of thought.

Quintilian, otherwise a good authority on matters of eloquence, is hardly correct in saying: *Fiunt oratores, nascuntur poetae*, which means that poetic genius is a gift of nature, while the oratorical power may be acquired by industry. We believe that orators are born as well as poets; but neither poets nor orators are born as full grown men, but as little infants, requir-

ing nursing and training, study and exercise. All men can speak as rational beings; for speech is the natural utterance or embodiment of reason, the most expressive revelation of thought. But few men are eloquent. Eloquence presupposes, besides the physical qualities of voice and action, certain mental endowments and aptitudes, such as an instinct which urges man to speak, as a bird to sing; a lively sensibility and imagination, good and strong sense, a communicative disposition and a goodly degree of courage which does not shrink from an audience. But these endowments must be drawn out and cultivated by education and practical application. Even an extemporised discourse, to be good and effective, presupposes a preliminary process of thought and a mind well stored with useful knowledge and disciplined to healthy and vigorous action. It is true, that a mere feeling or passion suddenly roused in a naturally strong and excitable mind may burst forth in an eloquent strain of words, like a volcano scattering around burning lava, or a cloud discharging thunder and lightning. Hence the eloquence of some Indian chiefs and other savages. But these are rare exceptions; and the same minds would produce far greater and more salutary effects if they were properly trained and turned into the path of regular and healthy action.

Hence, a book, like the one before us, is by no means superfluous. It abounds in fine observations and useful suggestions and hints, drawn from long study and experience, on the art, so useful and necessary especially in a free and republican country like ours, of extempore speaking from the pulpit, at the bar, and in the legislative hall. It is characterized by that clearness, directness, freshness and vivacity of style so characteristic of good French writers, without their bombast and declamatory smoke. There runs through it, moreover, a sound moral tone. The author advises every public speaker or lecturer to retire before the delivery. "You should take refuge within the depth of yourself, as in a sanctuary where the Almighty has deigned to manifest Himself, since your object in speaking is but to announce the truth, and the Almighty is Truth itself" (p. 219). He speaks of the sensation of a preacher, who feels the full weight of responsibility before God before the sermon, as a truly agonizing sensation. "Woe to him," (he says p. 221) "who experiences no fear before speaking in public! It shows him to be unconscious of the importance of the function which he is about to discharge,—that he does not understand what truth is, whose apostle he himself should be, or that he little cares, and that he is not animated by that sacred fire which comes down from heaven to burn in the soul. . . The fear in question is useful in making the speaker feel his want of help from above, such as shall give him the adequate light, strength and vividness of life. All men who have experience in public speaking, and who have ever them-

selves been eloquent, know how much they have owed to the inspiration of the moment, and to that mysterious power which gives it. It is precisely because a man may have sometimes received this efficacy from above, rendering him superior to himself, that he dreads being reduced to his own strength in that critical situation, and so to prove beneath the task which he has to accomplish." Prof. Bautain is a Roman Catholic and a priest, but without any polemical bias. He confines himself to the general Christian element. Every protestant minister will do well to follow his excellent advice on page 228:

"Oh, you who have taken the Lord for your inheritance, and who prefer the light and service of heaven to all the honors and all the works on earth, —you, particularly, who are called to the Apostleship, and who glow with the desire to announce to men the word of God! remember that here, more than anywhere else, virtue consists in disinterestedness, and power in abnegation of self. Endeavor to see in the triumphs of eloquence, if they be granted you, one thing only,—the glory of God. If you have the gift of touching the souls of others, seek one thing only,—to bring them, or bring them back, to God. For this end repress, stifle within your heart, the natural movements of pride, which, since the days of sin, would attribute all things to itself, even the most manifest and the most precious gifts; and each time that you have to convey to the people the Word of Heaven, ask urgently of God the grace to forget yourself, and to think of Him and of Him only."

P. S.

THE LIFE OF GENERAL H. HAVELOCK. By *J. T. Headley*. New York: Charles Scribner, 124 Grand Street.

This professes to be, and for all we know, is in fact the first complete biography of one of the most remarkable men of the present generation, at whose recent death the flags of the shipping in New York were hung at half mast—a mark of respect never before shown at the death of any chieftain or potentate of the old world. General Havelock was a military hero, and what is still better, an exemplary Christian man. His extraordinary achievements on the battle-field during the recent Indian rebellion, made known to the world also his virtue and piety. History hardly records greater deeds of heroism than those performed by Havelock and his little band at Cawnpore and Lucknow against the overwhelming forces of devils in human shape, who dared to outrage and butcher innocent Christian ladies and children in a manner so shocking and revolting that the pen refuses to describe it. These thrilling events are here narrated with that graphic power which characterizes all the writings of Mr. Headley, and has given them such an extensive circulation.

P. S.

Hermeneutical Manual: or Introduction to the Exegetical Study of the Scriptures of the New Testament. By *Patrick Fairbairn*, D. D., Principal and Prof. of Div. in the Free Church Coll., Glasgow. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 40 N. Sixth St. 1859.

Ernesti's Hermeneutics is too short and unsatisfactory; Seiler's more elaborate work has been translated in England, but never republished in this country; Cellerier's Manuel d' Herméneutique exists only in French; McClelland's book on the same subject is exhausted and will not be republished, as I learned some time ago from the author. For this reason the present work of the author of the "Typology of Scripture," a reprint from the Scotch edition, will be welcome as a guide to professors and students of Theological Seminaries. But while it meets a want, it is not exactly what we could wish it to be. It is confined to the N. T. only; it lacks the critical apparatus and literary references so desirable in a text book, and it is prolix and diffuse rather than condensed and suggestive. Still it is an instructive and useful book, animated by a good spirit, and gotten up in decent and substantial style.

P. S.

The New England Theocracy. A History of the Congregationalists in New England to the Revivals of 1760. By *H. F. Uhden*, with a Preface by the late Dr. Neander. Translated from the Second German edition by *H. C. Conant*. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1859.

Mr. Uhden, a pupil of Neander, and an old friend of ours, can better prepare material for a book than write a book. He resembles in this respect the late Dr. Henry, the biographer of Calvin. Literary industry and talent of composition are two different things, and by no means always united. The above book (which never passed through a second edition, the *title page* merely being changed) was one of the first attempts to bring New England Christianity before the mind of Germany. For this task Mr. Uhden had some qualification, having been in England twice, and being personally acquainted with several American clergymen then studying in Berlin. But to do this work thoroughly, would require a much larger range of sources than he had access to, and a protracted residence in New England, where alone a great deal of the material can be found, together with a living commentary upon it. Puritanism, as developed in America, and more particularly in New England, from the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers in 1620 down to the present time, is yet waiting for a historian.

P. S.

THE PIONEER BISHOP: or the Life and Times of *Francis Asbury*, By *W. B. Strickland.* With an Introduction by Nathan Bangs, D. D., Third Thousand. New York: Publ. by Carlton & Porter. 1859.

A popular contribution to the early history of Methodism in America, of which Asbury was a pioneer bishop. He was born in 1745 near Birmingham, England, early joined the Wesleyan movement, was licensed to preach at the age of seventeen, sent as missionary to the American colonies at his own request in 1771, ordained superintendent and bishop in 1784 together with Dr. Coke, travelled extensively through old and new settlements, preached, distributed Bibles and tracts, founded congregations and Sabbath schools, performed a great deal of self-denying labor and contributed as much as any man to the growth of Methodism in America, which since has become one of the leading denominations of this western world. He was for a number of years associated with Otterbein, a German Reformed minister and subsequently the founder of the religious society of the United Brethren. Of this connection, however, we find no information in the book before us. Asbury was unmarried in order to fulfil the more effectually his duties as an itinerant evangelist bishop. "Among the duties imposed upon me," he says, "by my office was that of traveling extensively, and I could hardly expect to find a woman with grace enough to enable her to live but one week out of the fifty-two with her husband; besides, what right has any man to take advantage of the affections of a woman, make her his wife, and by voluntary absence subvert the whole order and economy of the marriage state by separating those whom neither God, nature, or the requirements of civil society permit long to be put asunder. It is neither just nor generous. I may add to this, that I had but little money (—his salary was sixty-four dollars—) and with this little I administered to the necessities of a beloved mother till I was fifty-seven. If I have done wrong, I hope God and the sex will forgive me. It is my duty now to bestow the pittance I have to spare upon the widows and fatherless girls and poor married men." He carried with him in his saddle-bags, a Hebrew Bible, a Greek Testament, and the Methodist Book of Discipline. Traveling and preaching to the very last, he died in 1816 at Fredericksburg, Va., amid the reading of the 21st chapter of Revelations. His remains were removed to Baltimore, where a monument is to be erected to his memory by the Baltimore Conference.

P. S.

Abbeokuta oder Sonnenaufgang zwischen den Wendekreisen. Aus dem Englischen. Mit einer Einleitung von *Dr. W. Hoffmon,* Berlin: Wiegandt & Grieben. 1859.

A very interesting and valuable contribution to the history of missions in the interior of that mysterious continent which is now gradually opening to the eyes and enterprise of Christian Europe and America. We have here an account of one of the most remarkable and promising Protestant missions in the land of Yoruba in the tropical regions of Africa, translated in great part from English sources, and continued to the present time with an instructive and well written introduction by Dr. Hoffman, now court preacher and general superintendent of Berlin, but formerly for twelve years the principal of the Missionary Institute of Basel, where he made himself thoroughly master of the entire past history, present condition and future prospects of Protestant missions. If room would permit, we would translate a few pages of the introduction and discuss his views on the African slave trade, which the laws of the civilized world, and ours among the rest, have long ago declared piracy and assigned to infamy, but which nevertheless—incredibile dictu—threatens to become a serious political question in this land of freedom, progress and gospel light. There is a party in the South aided by contemptible dough faces in the North, which worship King Cotton and is ready to bring him any sacrifice. But they will only disgrace themselves in the eyes of the civilized world and prepare the way for their utter defeat. The book is gotten up in superior style and will probably be followed by similar monographs on the most successful Protestant missions.

P. S.

Summer Pictures: From Copenhagen to Venice. By *Henry M. Field.* New York: Sheldon & Company. 1859.

We have followed the author with lively interest on his recent summer excursion to England, France, Holland, Denmark and Austria, to the Bridge of Sighs in the dream-like city of the sea, the cathedral of Milan and the battle field of Novara, over scenes which are still fresh in our memory from a similar, though more extended tour. It is delightful to revisit so many countries and peoples in a few hours and to compare notes with an intelligent fellow traveler and sympathizing friend. Mr. Field, the editor of the New York Evangelist, is an amiable Christian gentleman of fine taste, close observation, genial spirit and considerable

power of appreciating foreign countries and national peculiarities. We heartily agree with his views on the English, the Dutch, the Danes, the home-life of France, and all he says about the beautiful and lovely type of character growing out of a union of the natural charm and grace of French manners with the solid strength and earnestness of Christian principle. But had he had equal facilities to be introduced to the family life in Germany, as he was in Paris with the very best of companions, to whom the book is so tastefully and appropriately dedicated, he would have formed a far superior idea of German character than is presented to us in the following amusing passage on page 177.

"There is only one thing in German manners which I can not get along with, and that is the universal habit of smoking. The whole German race seems to live in an atmosphere of smoke and beer. Germany is the land of pipes and mugs. All classes of people, from the highest to the lowest, smoke and drink, and drink and smoke. They smoke at all times and in all places, in the house and by the way, in public gardens, and in railway carriages, when they lie down and when they rise up. They smoke before breakfast, and smoke after dinner. Morning, noon and night, smoke, smoke, smoke. Indeed I believe a German's idea of heaven is a place where every man is provided with a huge meerchaum, with which, extended before him, he sits in repose, his spirit absorbed in dreams, while perpetual wreaths float around his head, the symbol of eternal beatitude. If it be so that this is the German's heaven, I desire to enter some other department in the celestial mansions, marked like the ladies railway carriages, *Für Nichtraucher.*"

I appreciate Mr. Field's aversion to the mug and the pipe (reserving only an occasional cigar in the study); but he must permit us to say that his description is about as just as if we were to describe the American idea of heaven as consisting in plenty of dollars and whiskey on the Northern, and plenty of niggers and tobacco chewing on the Southern side. Mr. Field knows very well, that the Germans do a great many other and better things than smoke and drink But unfortunately he got to Berlin at the very worst season of the year, when its chief attraction, the University is closed, and all the literary celebrities are scattered abroad, and this disappointment seems to have somewhat interrupted his genial and happy humor. His pictures of Vienna, and especially of Venice, Lombardy and the battle-field of the Austrians and Sardinians in 1848 and 1849, with his remarks on these antagonistic nations and their

political prospects are appreciating and just and will be read with double interest at the present momentous crisis, when events of far reaching importance are transpiring on those fertile and beautiful plains, which no traveler can visit without mingled feelings of delight and pain, according as he looks more into the past or the present, the enchanting beauties of nature and art, or the discontented and unsettled condition of the people groaning under a strong but hated foreign government.

P. S.

Spiritual Reciprocity between Pastor and Flock: A sermon by Edward D. Yeomans on his installment as Pastor of the Fourth Presbyterian church, Trenton, N. J.—Rom. 1: 11, 12.—Published by the Congregation. 1859.

We notice this chaste discourse for its deep, spiritual—not spiritualistic—view of the Church.

The Church is one living body, in which there are "many members." Ministers live in the common life of the whole body. They and the people share the "one Spirit." In a congregation both have their respective, equally important offices; and the pastor's ministry edifies the people, only as the people do their part to edify themselves and the pastor. In Public Worship, which is the act of the whole congregation, he prays *with* them and they pray with him. He puts the word of confession, of thanksgiving and of adoration into their mouths before God. In Public Instruction he speaks to the people in the name of the Lord, and the people receive the truth in faith. In the care of souls he represents the Great Shepherd in his personal friendly communion with his flock, and the flock responds in a hearty recognition of this his office, touching and warming him by the prompt expression of their wants. Thus in every department of duty there is a reciprocity of offices between pastor and people; and the office of the people, though very different, is no less real, necessary and important than that of the pastor.

These are the leading views. The congregation that will unfold the idea of the reciprocal offices of pastor and people into harmonious, living reality, will never need a religious excitement, or what is commonly called an extraordinary outpouring of the Spirit; but, abiding in the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, it will grow day by day, like a tree planted by the rivers of water, and bring forth its fruit in its season.

E. V. G.

We have received other new works from their respective authors or publishers. But having had no time to examine them, we can only give their titles:

The Immortality of the Soul and the Final Condition of the Wicked carefully considered. By *Robert W. Landis.* New York: Carlton & Porter. 1859.

Pleasant Pathways.; or Persuasives to Early Piety. By *Daniel Wise.* New York. Carlton & Porter. 1859.

A Treatise on Theism, and on the Modern Skeptical Theories. By *Francis Wharton,* Prof. in Kenyon Coll., O. Philadelphia: Lippencott & Co. 1859.

THE

MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1859.

Art. I.—RELIGION AND CHRISTIANITY.

Christianity may be called the religion of Jesus Christ; or the *true* religion, all the religions of the world being regarded as false. Using the terms in such relation to each other, we imply both a difference and a connection between the objects which they name; a difference, however, which holds between a genus and one of the species belonging to it, and a connection which consists in the possession of elements common to both. Religion is the general term and applicable to Buddhism, Parseeism, or Mohammedanism with as much propriety as to Christianity; each system is a religion; whilst Christianity is a particular term designating the system of truth revealed in Jesus Christ, and none other. Christianity is *a* religion; but because the only true one, it is called by way of emphasis *the* religion. Or, to use a logical expression, we may say, according to this view of their difference, that religion is the more *extensive* and Christianity the more *intensive* term; the one applying to all systems no matter what be their character, and the other to but one system which includes the truth and excludes the errors of all, and besides contains what no other system does or can contain.

This view of the relation of religion to Christianity, considering the general subject scientifically, we deem insufficient. It fails to recognize the essential nature of Christianity as something unique—as something which is not shared by any Pagan system, nor even by Judaism. It seems also to overlook the fact, that all the religions of the

world taken together constitute a class. They are all developed from the same principle active in the heart of mankind, and possess common and essential characteristics; a principle and characteristics which do not enter into the constitution of Christianity. We think that Christianity differs from religion, or from all the religions of the world, not specifically, nor in degree, but generically or in kind. There must be a generic difference between the opposing systems.

This generic difference we shall endeavor to unfold; but in order to prepare the way for it, we propose, in the first place, to review the distinctions which arise on what we regard as the insufficient principle of difference.

The first and most common distinction relates to their origin. Pagan systems are the religions of nature, or *natural* religion, but Christianity is a *revealed* religion. The one is derived from reflection on the natural world; the other is established by divine revelation. This distinction, however, proceeds on the assumption that the constitution of nature and supernatural revelation are opposites. It implies that nature is not a certain revelation of God, and that the supernatural revelation of Christ is given independently of the natural world; an assumption that can certainly not stand the test of criticism. There is no such opposition. The two things do not exclude but include each other.

Nature itself is a certain revelation of the existence and majesty of God; so certain that all men possess the fundamental truth without any knowledge of Christ; so certain that neither the Old nor the New Testament formally teach it. The first book of Genesis opens with: "In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth;" and proceeds throughout, like every other book of the Sacred Scriptures in the same spirit; thus assuming the principle that belief in the Majesty of God is certainly at hand in the minds of all to whom they are addressed. They teach clearly what He is, what His will is, what He has done, is doing and will do; but not that He is. This fact na-

ture reveals with irresistible authority; so authoritatively that they deal at once with a pretended atheist as a wicked man: "The fool has said in his heart, there is no God." (Ps. 14: 1.)

The revelation of nature is immediate. The knowledge of God it affords is not obtained only from logical reflection on it, or from scientific study, as if the scholar alone could acquire it; but it arises directly from the constitution of things, so that all classes of men possess it, however ignorant they may be in all other respects. The heavens *declare* the glory of God; and the firmament showeth His handy-work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. (Ps. 19: 1–3.) The external world says to every human being: God is, and God is great.

Not only the external world but man also is a revelation of God. Man makes God known to himself. Not that he does this at will or merely by thinking on himself, his body, soul and spirit, or on his manifold relations; but the knowledge of God is developed directly in his consciousness. Whenever the development of his rational being goes forward normally the idea of God arises in his mind immediately. It springs from himself, or, as Mansel expresses it, "We are compelled by the constitution of our minds to believe in the existence of an Absolute and Infinite Being,—a belief which appears forced upon us, as the complement of our consciousness of the relative and finite."* The same thing is taught by the Apostle Paul. Speaking of the state of the heathen, he says; "That which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath showed it unto them." (Rom. 2: 19.) That which may be known of God is His eternal power and Godhead; and this is manifest *in* the heathen. Their idea and views of God they get from the visible creation and from themselves. In other words, they and the world are a natural revelation

* Limits of Religious Thought, p. 91.

of God, a revelation so certain and satisfactory, as far as it goes, that humanity neither needs nor demands corroboration of its great truths from any other source.

It follows that the religions of the world rest on a revelation as really as Christianity; and we can not say, religion is natural, but Christianity revealed. Both are revealed; the one in nature, the other in Christ. Nature and revelation are then not contradictory opposites; and Christianity does not differ from religion in being a certain and authoritative revelation of God. Religion is the same. But the two systems differ as to the matter revealed. That which Christianity is and reveals, is generically different from that which nature reveals in all systems of religion. And just because the revelation of God in the external world and in man is so authoritative and indestructible does there exist the deepest and an intensely painful necessity in the fallen, sinful, helpless subject of religion for that higher and more glorious and truly satisfying revelation which has been accomplished in Christianity.

But as nature does not exclude revelation, so neither does revelation exclude nature. The distinction we are reviewing seems to divorce in thought the things which are in reality connected. It divorces nature from revelation. This we have shown to be an error; for the constitution of nature is a true revelation. So it divorces revelation from nature. It seems to regard revelation and especially the Christian Revelation as an act of Almighty God done independently of the order of the natural world. This is undoubtedly an error also. Christianity is a revelation in and through nature much more really than any system the world has ever produced. Indeed all revelation of divine, invisible and eternal things adapted to man's rational being is possible only in as far as it addresses him in natural and finite forms. For though man unfolds from himself an idea of God and of an unchangeable relation to Him, and is endowed with the capacity of living communion with the Invisible and Eternal, he is nevertheless a finite being; he lives in finite relations; and must think in finite

categories of thought. He can not rise in modes of thought above the sphere of existence to which he belongs. When he thinks of God he must do it in a human way. Above nature, therefore, or in supernatural and super-human forms God can not address man; and never has done it. Could we believe such an act possible it would accomplish no conceivable purpose. Remaining in a sphere of manifestation which is above and outside of the constitution of nature, the Divine Being would be totally separated from man and continue to be the Unknown One. To become known He must cease to be thus totally separated from him and draw near in a way which is congenial to human being. He must manifest Himself not in a form foreign to man, but in the very form in which the laws of his rational constitution require man to think and to know.

This is the very idea which meets us in the Christian revelation. It runs through all its preparatory stages as recorded in the Old Testament. God speaks to man in human language and in modes of conception which prevail in a particular age of the world, in a particular country and among a particular people. He manifests Himself in dreams and visions. He exhibits His supernatural power and majesty in wonderful deeds wrought by His commissioned servants before the eyes of the people. He represents His personal glory by a visible symbol, the mysterious cloud dwelling on the mercy-seat between the cherubim. The import and relations of the great promise, which, first uttered in Eden, develops itself in ever-increasing fulness during four thousand years like the life of the mustard-seed in the growth of the tree, He teaches in civil regulations, in outward rites, in special ordinances and bloody sacrifices, which were observed from day to day for a period of fifteen hundred years.

All these forms of divine revelation were outward, visible, tangible, real. They were derived from every department of the natural world, from the mineral, vegetable and animal kingdoms; from man himself, from his birth, stages of growth, maturity and death; from social and civil relations,

and from the entire sphere of his natural life. The virgin of truth came to men from Heaven, not irradiated with the pure, infinite halo of uncreated glory, but robed in the most simple yet most beautiful garments and adorned with the richest jewelry of earth. Nor was this mode of approach arbitrary or accidental. It was not a temporary accommodation to human ignorance and weakness. But, on the principle just stated, it was necessary. It was imperatively demanded by the entire constitution of humanity; and, were the Old Testament dispensation not completed in Christ, would be as necessary now, if God would reveal Himself, as it was then.

The Old Testament dispensation foreshadowed our Lord Jesus Christ, was preparatory to His coming and became complete in Him. He was the last and most perfect revelation of God. Answering to, transcending and completing all previous modes of divine manifestation, He took the place of them, and thus they were abolished in Him. But in perfecting and consummating the revelation of Himself in the person of Christ, God did not abrogate the principle on which all previous revelations had been made. He did not cease to manifest Himself in natural forms; but this mode of manifestation was developed to the highest possible degree of perfection. Before, His relation to nature was rather external and transient. God at sundry times and in divers manners spake unto the fathers by the prophets; (Heb. 1: 1). He showed His great power in plagues, in the division of the Red Sea, in thunderings and lightnings, in the overthrow of the Canaanites, and so on; but He did not become Moses or Elijah; He did not transform Himself into thunder or lightning, nor into the visible Shekinah. Now, however, in Christ His relation to nature becomes internal and permanent. He is not in man as He was in Moses; He does not only speak and work through man, as he did through Elijah; but God becomes man. God is united to man. God and man do not indeed become identical, yet they become really and eternally one. The Word *was made flesh* and dwelt among

us, the Apostle John informs us. God sent "his own Son in *the likeness of sinful flesh.*" (Rom. 8: 3.) Forasmuch as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He who is the brightness of God's glory and the express image of His person and upholds all things by the word of His power, Himself likewise took part of the same. He took not on Him the nature of angels but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. (Heb. 2: 14–16.) Without controversy, therefore, great is the mystery of godliness: God was manifest, or manifested, in the flesh. (1 Tim. 3: 16.) The word *flesh* denotes humanity, or human nature. Man as the head of the natural world is the most perfect embodiment of its idea and laws, and is consequently in living connection and sympathy with its lower orders and forms of existence. In the broadest and most literal sense, therefore, is the manifestation of God in man, according to the unequivocal teachings of the New Testament, the revelation of the supernatural in the natural, of the infinite in the finite, of the absolute in the relative, of the invisible in the visible, of eternity in time. Human nature the Son of God assumed into organic union with Himself, and thus it, that is, man himself becomes the concrete form under which God reveals Himself to man. That which is above and beyond all modes of human conception and all the categories of human thinking, approaches man under these limited modes of conception and categories of thinking—addresses him conformably to all the demands of his sensuo-rational nature—and is in consequence revealed to him. The unknown becomes known by assuming the form of that which both knows and is known.

The assumed antithesis between natural and revealed religion is therefore not valid. Nature, or the physical creation, is indeed not the only, much less a sufficient revelation of God; and the supernatural order of revelation reveals what is infinitely different from the teachings of the natural world. Yet the natural world *is* a form of undoubted revelation of divine and invisible things; and on the other hand, the highest revelation of God, was made in its

preparatory stages in outward natural forms, and consummated at last in the physico-rational constitution of humanity. The natural reveals the supernatural; and the supernatural can reveal itself in no way but through the medium of the natural. Hence the antithetical relation in which nature is set to revelation affords no valid basis for a scientific distinction between the religions of the world and Christianity.

We proceed to consider another received distinction. The religions of the world are said to be *false*, but Christianity is the *true* religion. Though valid in some respects, yet we can not regard the antithesis as expressing a correct conception of the reciprocal relation of the two systems. Christianity is indeed the truth emphatically. Christ is the revelation of God and of man; the real Mediator between both; the only One who can take away sin in its root and its consequences and the only Regenerator and Restorer to all its normal relations of fallen humanity. He is complemental to and actually satisfies all the demands, whether known or unknown, of the entire man. In this respect no religion can compare with Christianity. But it does not follow from the exclusive claim of Christ to being the real Saviour of mankind, that the insufficient religions of the world are entirely false—that they contain no truth, but are systems of unmixed error. The presumption is in favor of the contrary judgment, that there is truth also in every religion, even in the very lowest system of Paganism; otherwise there would be no subjective basis for Christianity. There would be no point of contact between the God-man, Jesus Christ, and degenerate, ignorant and miserable men—no capacity to appreciate, or be awakened even to a dark sense of the significance of His person and work. There would be no principle in the Pagan mind and character of which Christianity could lay hold in order to develop a purer consciousness and a higher order of human life.

This presumption is fully sustained by the religious history of the world. Every system of religion is based upon

and incorporates certain primary elements of undoubted truth. The first of all, which is fundamental to every other, is the idea of a Supreme Being. There is a God, is the spontaneous utterance of the human heart. What God is, man can not determine; hence the prevailing notion of His being may be very crude, low and degrading, for it will always be modified by the peculiar character of a people; but the belief that He exists, is the principle which lies at the bottom of every system of religion and pervades the entire consciousness of mankind. It is the first and deepest of all truths. Springing directly from it, is the sense and perception of a real but mysterious relation between God and man; and this felt relation gives rise necessarily to several ruling cognate ideas, namely, the idea of right and wrong; the idea of a state of sin or moral evil; of worship, or of the propriety of some mode or form of communion with Deity; of a future state of existence; and of the necessity of some means of restoring man to the favor and fellowship of God. With more or less clearness and fulness every Pagan religion embodies these ideas as its essential elements. In one religion, one idea becomes the ruling element to which the others are held subordinate; in another religion, it is some other idea which gives character to the system; so that the truth which is the fundamental principle in one developed system, holds a subordinate place in another; and the reverse. Thus there have originated as many systems, or different kinds, of religion as there are intuitive truths which the perverted human reason has taken for the fundamental principle. Considered as systems of salvation, therefore, these religions are all false; yet the principles from which they spring are great truths. They are false because the particular truth taken as a principle is not *the* principle of a system that can save men. The principle is a truth, but the truth is a false principle; and because false, there is no saving power in the system, nor in any truths which the system embraces. The incorporated truth itself is perverted by error of principle and becomes the occasion of deeper degradation and

misery. The fundamental idea of Mohammedanism, for example, is a great truth, namely, that *God is one God*—monotheism in opposition to polytheism—but this great truth is not the principle of the true system, of a system that can deliver men from the power and guilt of sin and restore them to holy fellowship with God. No fallen man is saved because he believes in one God, worships Him according to the dictates of his conscience and seeks earnestly to conform to all His known requirements. All who believe in Christianity must regard salvation as flowing from a very different source.—Any other religion of man would serve to illustrate the same important distinction.

Christianity, on the other hand, does not only contain truth, but it rests also in a true principle. It is determined in its entire order by a truth which is really fundamental to all other truths; a truth which is the principle of all other principles; a truth which presupposes the truths of religion and includes them, and so includes them that they become integral parts of a sublime whole. Holding such a relation in Christianity to a true principle, the truths of religion acquire supernatural vitality; and possess power to bring man to that state of spiritual blessedness, which, in all ages, though in possession of these same truths, but not in possession of the transforming power of the true principle, he has struggled in vain to reach.

Adopting this view of the primary elements of religion, it becomes evident that we can not distinguish properly between it and Christianity, by calling the one false and the other true. These primary elements being primary truths which are at hand in man as the subjective basis of Christianity, and which are taken up into it, the distinction does wrong in two directions. It deals a blow of death to the left and to the right. It does wrong to religion and to man. For it turns the universal belief in Deity into a lie, the universal idea of the morally right and the morally wrong into a shadow; and the universal tendency and sense of obligation to worship, or hold communion with a Power above man, into superstition. It does wrong too

to Christianity and to God. For the revelation of God in Christ proceeds at every point on the presumption that man's belief in God and in a mysterious relation of man to God is true, and that his religious wants and tendencies are a most solemn reality. If this presumption of the Sacred Scriptures be regarded as false, Christianity stands chargeable with a great mistake, a mistake that is incompatible with its claim to the unreserved confidence of mankind.

There is another distinction between religion and Christianity which we deem insufficient. The religions of the world are many, Christianity is one. Each religion is sectional, suited to the peculiar temperament, character and habits of a particular race or nation, whilst Christianity is suited alike to all races and all nations. Christianity is, therefore, a religion for the world, or the *world-religion*, but any other religious system is not.

In this distinction there is some propriety, yet it does not afford a correct conception of the difference. Christianity is indeed adapted to the deepest wants of all nations and kindreds and tongues alike. It is adapted to human ignorance, to human guilt and human misery; for it pours a flood of pure light from heaven into the darkened understanding; it purges the conscience from dead works to serve the living God; it awakens the dead in sin to a new life of faith in Christ Jesus; it sustains and develops that new life in its conflict with sin and the powers of darkness; and it produces peace in the heart, order in society and harmony between the races and nations of the world. These essential tendencies of its nature satisfy the painful yearnings of the human spirit in life and in death; and with equal freshness and power in all cases, without regard to sex, age, periods of history, climate or nationality. Christianity is for *man* unconditionally. No other system sustains such a relation to him. None other is adapted to and satisfies the wants of the world. So far forth this distinction between Christianity and religion is correct. The contents of the one positively meet the demand of the whole world, those of the other do not.

But the distinction is not correct if it imply that, though not adapted to the whole world, some systems of religion, as distinguished from Christianity, are nevertheless positively suited to a particular age of the world—to a particular race or nation; as if the difference consisted merely in a greater or less extensive adaptation to the wants of mankind. Each religion, it is thought, may suit a particular nation, but Christianity suits all nations. Such an implication is not valid. Religion or any non-Christian system, is not only not adapted to the *whole* world, but, in the sense in which the objective contents of Christianity meet the actual demands of humanity, it is not even adapted to any one age or nation. Every religion fails of its end. Mohammedanism satisfies the moral and religious nature of the Turk or Arab as little as it can that of the Swiss or the Germans. Brahminism can satisfy the Hindoos as little as it could Englishmen or Frenchmen.

There is a sense, however, we readily admit, in which a religion is suited or adapted to the people who embrace it. Mohammedanism, as a system, was shaped by the general intellectual, religious and political status of the East during the sixth and seventh centuries, as well as by the genius and ambition of Mohammed; hence there is a certain original sympathy or congeniality between the religion of Mohammed and the character of his followers; and we may accordingly speak of the one as being adapted to the other. So too may we speak of the adaptation of Brahminism to the Hindoos. Brahminism is the outgrowth of the thoughtful, contemplative character of the ancient Hindoo, and in consequence bears the impress of his own mind and spirit. The doctrines of the Vedas, the division of society into castes, and all the religious customs and forms of worship, constitute the spiritual element in which he lives and moves with freedom. The character of the Hindoo answers to his religion, and his religion answers to him. Hence we may speak of a correspondence between Brahminism and the Hindoos, that does not exist between Parseeism or Mohammedanism and the Hindoos; and that

does not exist either between Brahminism and the character of the roving hordes on the desert plains of Arabia. Brahminism is not a congenial element for the followers of Mohammed; nor is Mohammedanism a congenial element for the worshippers of the Hindoo triad, Brahma, Vishnu and Siva, the Creator, Preserver and Destroyer. It is true that "a considerable number of the Hindoo race were converted to this faith, and profess it to this day. But it could take no hold of the heart of the people, for it solved no difficulty which was perplexing them; it affirmed a truth which staggered them, and before which they bowed; one, however, which in this form coalesced with scarcely any conditions of their intellectual or of their moral being."* The religions are dissimilar, because the people are dissimilar from whom the religions originated.

Such correspondence, however, between a people and their religion is very different in kind from the adaptation of Christianity to every age and nation. A religion being the spotaneous product of a people, it can not be different from the general mind of the people; nor can it be higher or better than they are. It is but the spiritual image of their own mysterious inner being. The correspondence is consequently purely subjective. The relation is not that of an external, independent, objective reality, corresponding positively to the demands of a dependent subject. But it is the relation of a subject to the unsubstantial reflection of itself. A religion is suited to a people as a dream is to a man. A farmer dreams of his waiving grain; a merchant of his purchases and sales; a soldier of the battle-field; a philosopher of his abstruse speculations; and a traveller in a strange land of the endearments of his far-off home. The dreams of each are suitable to his condition; and those of the one can not be substituted for those of the other. Each one projecting his own habit of life is confronted by the image of himself, and with this he is in direct sympathy. But these projections of the imagination can not satisfy.

* The Religions of the World by Maurice. p. 77.

The image of a table covered with meats, bread and fruits, may delight the heart of a poor hungry beggar sleeping by the wayside; but it does not stop the cravings of hunger; and he wakes up to a keener sense of his poverty and wo. So does Brahminism correspond to the character of the Hindoo; but as the object of his adoration is not the true God and Saviour, but only his idea of God invested with the mysterious qualities and relations of his own spiritual nature, it possesses no objective power for the Hindoo—no power essentially different from himself to deliver him from the bondage of evil and infuse new life into his heart.

The adaptation, on the contrary, of Christianity to the wants of the world is objective and positive. Christianity is a spiritual reality outside of man and essentially different from him, which derives its nature and attributes neither from the genius of an individual nor from the character of a nation, but from the constitution of a Person who of God is made unto men wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption. It answers to the heart of man, not as face answers to face in a looking-glass, nor as a dream of a feast answers to the painful gnawings of hunger; but as the light of the rising sun answers to the waking eye, as the harmonies of music answer to the listening ear, as a loaf of good bread answers to the cravings of a famishing beggar, or as a spring of sparkling water answers to the thirst of a way-worn traveller. The light of the sun, a loaf of bread and fresh water are so many veritable objects in the external world whose positive qualities correspond to, and when appropriated, actually satisfy men's natural wants. So is Christianity a veritable spiritual object, a new creation in Christ Jesus, whose positive elements and power flowing from Him are adapted to all the wants of individuals and of the world, whether spiritual, moral, intellectual, physical or social, and when appropriated by a true faith remove these wants according to the law of its own life and raise man to a state of inward, real and satisfying fellowship with God. Such positive adaptation differs as widely from the congeniality of a religion with the

character of a people, as the adaptation of a running stream in the desert to a weary caravan differs from that of the deceitful mirage. Religion is in fact not adapted at all to any actual wants of a people. The contents of the system possess no objective reality, and serve therefore only to intensify and mock the deepest yearnings of the spirit.

To distinguish between religion and Christianity by calling one a national or sectional religion and the other the world-religion involves, as we think, another error of a different kind. We have considered this distinction as it affects and does a wrong to Christianity, implying that its positive suitableness to mankind is shared by religion, only less extensively, and thus overlooking the essential difference between the two systems. We must consider the distinction also as it affects and does a wrong to religion, implying that religion is less extensive in its adaptation to mankind than Christianity. This assumption is certainly erroneous; for it can be shown that religion is as broad as Christianity. If we consider the actual condition of Christianity in the world, we may say even that religion is broader; for under one or another of its numerous forms it belongs to or must be predicated of all nations, whilst, to say the most, Christianity has as yet become the faith of not more than one-third of the human family.

That religion is as broad as Christianity becomes evident from a consideration of the relation which the many and various systems of religion sustain to each other. They spring, not from similar principles, but from one and the same fundamental principle from which are developed the same primary elements in all. These systems are different, it is true, because they start in different primary truths, as we have already endeavored to show; which truths operate as so many different principles, each giving rise to a particular system possessing characteristics peculiar to itself. But these particular principles are grounded in a deeper and broader one which is common to them all; for this one deepest principle, which we call fundamental, is lodged not only in some individuals, or some nations, or some

races, to the exclusion of others, but it is an essential attribute of humanity as such, irrespective of the difference of nationalities or races. It is the subjective idea of a Supreme Being, which is developed in man, with the normal development of his rational nature, as an immediate fact of consciousness. Subjective we call it, not because the idea is in the subject, man, or belongs to him, but because the informing power of the idea is in man. It originates from him and its contents are determined by him. The idea is neither more nor less, as to form and matter, than the fallen constitution of man makes it in the ordinary process of development. As this idea, from which are derived the subordinate ideas of dependence, of obligation, of right and wrong, of guilt, of mediation and worship, is the fundamental principle of all religions, and as it belongs to humanity as a whole, two things must be regarded as true. The one, that the many religions of the world, however they may differ, constitute in reality but one religion; each being a particular development of the same first principle and incorporating the same essential elements under a modified form. The other, that religion is as extensive as humanity, there being no race or nation on the face of the globe which is destitute of it. Religion belongs to the world. It is world religion as really as Christianity, the one being the general expression and embodiment of the world's deepest needs, the other the expression and embodiment of the positive grace of Almighty God adapted to and designed for the real satisfaction of these universal needs.

Religions are analogous to races. There are many races, that is, permanent modifications of body and mind perpetuated by natural generation, yet but *one* human race—but one humanity; because every individual, as well as each particular race, possesses that sensuo-rational life and those essential qualities in virtue of which a being is a man, and is distinguished from every other class of beings.

Religions are analogous also to languages. There are innumerable languages and dialects. Each one has an

etymology, a syntactical arrangement, an idiom, and a pronunciation, which is peculiar to itself. Hence they differ, and some of them very much; as much so as any two religions which are most unlike each other. Yet the principle which underlies languages and determines the general structure of each, is the same in all. The categories of thought which they embody, and the general laws by which they are governed, are identical. That, in a word, in virtue of which a form of articulation is human speech, is common alike to all. Whilst, therefore, there are many forms of human speech, there is at bottom but one language. A sound philosophy of one language is a sound philosophy of all languages.

The religions of the world stand related to religion as such, as the nationalities and races stand related to humanity, or as the dialects and languages do to language. On the one side we have particular forms of expression, each form possessing its own distinctive characteristics. On the other we have a principle, a life, a law of life, from which the particular forms are developed, and from which they derive a common fundamental character. In these repects humanity, language and religion are alike. The Circassian race is a particular form of humanity; Latin a particular form of language; and Buddhism a particular form of religion. On the other hand, there is but one humanity in the world; and, philosophically considered, but one language and but one religion. The three things are likewise equally extensive. Where there is a mature human being, there is some form of speech and some form of religion.

Broader, then, or more comprehensive than religion is, Christianity, in its relation to man, can not be. Indeed religion, in the nature of the case, must always precede Christianity in the order of time, as an indispensable condition of its extension. He only can be made a partaker of Christ and His benefits who possesses a religious nature. Could we conceive of a man without religion, or without any religious ideas, wants and instincts, he would be one who would be incapable of becoming a Christian; Christi-

anity would not be adapted to him. So far from Christianity being adapted to the world whilst religion is not, the truth is that Christianity is thus adapted to the wants of the world just because the whole world is religious.

Before we proceed to enquire more directly into the difference between religion and Christianity, we will yet consider one other distinction which we can not but regard as insufficient. It is that Christianity is a religion of the Spirit of God, whilst all other systems are not of the Spirit, but purely of the flesh.

We do not for a moment think of denying that the Holy Ghost, poured out according to the word of Christ on the day of Pentecost upon the assembled disciples under the miraculous form of a "rushing mighty wind" and "cloven tongues as of fire," proceeded from the Father and the Son, and has continued to abide among His people from that day to this, and will abide among them down to the end of time. Nor do we deny that the presence and operation of the Spirit as connected with and proceeding from Jesus Christ is the only saving operation upon the hearts of sinful men. The Spirit of Christ alone can regenerate, sanctify and glorify by establishing and sustaining a vital union of men to the glorious Person of the God-man.

But the Sacred Scriptures require us to deny that the saving operation of the Spirit is His only operation upon the hearts of men; or that His presence and influence in the world is confined within the sphere of Christianity, and that consequently the entire non-Christian world is, and has always been, excluded from the influences of the Spirit. The Scriptures teach just the opposite. The Holy Ghost operates even upon the natural or material world. It was He who in the beginning brought forth the order and beauty of the heavens and earth from a shapeless, chaotic mass of matter. "And the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (Gen. 1: 2.) The original word *ruahh* does indeed denote properly *breath* or *wind;* but from the constitution of human nature the

name of a supersensible object is always derived from, or suggested by, a sensible one on the principle of resemblance or analogy between them. It is so here. The word designates the Spirit of God. So it was understood and rendered by the English Translators. So it is interpreted also by the most trustworthy commentators. The passage teaches accordingly that as the eagle spreads her wings over her young, warming and protecting them and unfolding their young lives into mature and complete form, so did God by His Spirit operate upon, and in, chaotic matter to produce the present order of the world. This sense is clearly sustained by other passages. "By his *spirit* he hath garnished the heavens." (Job 26: 13.) "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the host of them by the breath (*ruahh*) of his mouth." (Ps. 33: 6.) "Thou sendest forth thy spirit (*ruahh*), they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth." (Ps. 104: 30.) From these and other passages of Scripture we must infer that God by His Spirit is present and active in the material world, not pantheistically or as being identified with its life, yet really as Creator and Preserver ever maintaining its constitution and renewing the diversified forms of its existence.

If present in the material world, how much more so in the human kingdom where the import of all lower orders of existence gains its highest expression. The presumption certainly is that the Spirit of God operates upon mankind in general no less than upon matter. We are not left, however, to the resources of our own judgment. The Bible abounds with hints on the subject. When the wickedness of the world became so great that God determined to destroy the entire race, (Noah and his family excepted,) He said "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." "Man" must denote the antediluvian world. God willed that his Spirit should no longer contend, in temporal judgments and in the utterances of the conscience, against the strong disposition of the race to do evil—a disposition which like a mighty current bore away every obstacle to

its progress. This of course implies that up to that time the Spirit had been with sinful man striving in him against evil. By way of confirmation compare 1 Peter 3 : 18–20.

It is stated in the Book of Numbers that when the children of Israel had conquered the Amorites and pitched in the plains of Moab, Balak, the king of the Moabites, sent messengers to Balaam, entreating him to come and curse the Israelites ; for they were too mighty for him. (Num. 22–24.) Then follows an interesting account of the conduct of Balaam, the whole of which illustrates the special communications of God to the mind of a man who did not belong to the chosen nation. It is stated expressly that "the Spirit of God came upon "Balaam ; "and he took up his parable, and said," &c. (Num. 24 : 2.)

Passing by other similar instances, occurring in the Old Testament, of the Spirit's directly influencing the minds of men outside of the Jewish Church, we will examine one or two of the declarations of the New. In his discourse to the Athenians delivered on Mar's Hill, the Apostle Paul uses the following language : God "hath made of one blood all nations of men, for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation : that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him, though *he be not far from every one of us :* for in him we live and move and have our being ; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring." (Acts 17 : 26–28.) The Apostle teaches that there is an important sense in which God governs the heathen, and is with them (by His Spirit,) begetting a deep sense of the vanity and misery of the world and exciting a disposition to seek Him, in whom they live, and move and have their being. Under such influences the heathen poet, Aratus, utters the sentiment : "For we are all His offspring," which the Apostle embodies in his discourse as a truth of God.

Another apposite passage occurs in his Epistle to the Romans. "The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the

truth in unrighteousness. Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath revealed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even His eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse. Because that when they knew God, they glorified him, not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened: professing themselves to be wise they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves: who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen." (Rom. 2: 18–25.) We quote the entire passage because the bearing of particular clauses upon the point in hand depends upon their connection with the whole. The Apostle is evidently speaking not of the Jews, but of the Gentiles—of the pagan world. The heathen hold the *truth*, he says, but in unrighteousness. This truth is that which may be known of God, and is manifest *in* them. It is manifest in the heathen because *God hath showed* it unto them. He showed them invisible things, even his eternal power and Godhead, which are clearly seen from the creation of the world. Nor was His presence and teaching in vain. For they knew God; but they did not glorify Him as God. Through the perverting power of sin they became unthankful for His goodness and mercy. Turning away from Him in the vanity of their imaginations they changed the glory of God into an image of a man and beast. Wherefore God gave them up to uncleanness; He had not thus given them up before; but as a consequence of their folly and wickedness He permitted them to change the truth of God, which they still possessed, into a lie, and then worship the creature more than the Creator. As God had shown the truth

unto the heathen, they knew God, the Creator; and because they knew the Creator they worshipped Him. But when their foolish heart was darkened they substituted the creature for the Creator.

If we correctly interpret the account which the Apostle gives of the spiritual condition of the heathen, we must believe that God by no means left them to themselves, but just as before the flood His Spirit strove with an apostate race, so after the flood did the same Spirit manifest God in them and to them; and, through the law written on their hearts, won them to the acknowledgment of the truth, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another. (Rom. 2 : 15.) Hence, as a result of divine action upon the mind of the pagan world, do their systems of religion comprehend the great truths which we call self-evident or intuitive, the truths which the Revelation of Christ presupposes and assumes at every step of its progress, and thus acknowledges to be divine. Nor was such manifestation of God in the heathen without purpose, nor in vain. On the one hand, it served to keep alive in them the deep sense of the need of a Deliverer, and on the other to perpetuate and unfold in them the religious capacity for that very different and higher work of the Spirit by which Christ should be formed in them the hope of glory when the fulness of the times had come.

There is no contradiction to this view of their religious history, in the idolatries, the inveterate corruptions, and abominable immoralities prevailing among the heathen. Just because they are wicked and vile by nature has it been the good pleasure of God to exercise the forbearance, mercy and condescension which the Apostle Paul teaches. And if even in the Church of Christ, which he purchased with His own blood, of which He is the living Head, and which is the "ground of the truth," the tares sown by the Enemy spring up with the wheat and are permitted to grow together until the time of harvest, how much more so in the pagan world upon which the glorious Sun of

Righteousness has not risen with the life-giving power of divine healing in his wings.

It follows that the presence and influences of the Spirit are not distinctive of Christianity; and if not distinctive, if the Spirit may in a certain sense be predicated of all the religions of the world, it does not touch the real point of difference between the two systems to say that the one is the religion of the Spirit, whilst the other is the religion of the flesh. There is indeed a creative work of the Holy Spirit, generically different from all His other known operations, which is the peculiar glory of Christianity, but this peculiar work is not inconsistent with the reality of that operation of the Spirit which obtains expression in non-Christian systems. There are diversities of operations; but it is the same God which worketh all in all. (1 Cor. 12: 6.) The flesh has not only exerted a corrupting influence in the religions of the world, but has also contributed towards bringing about the actual condition of Christianity and of the Church among men in every period of her history. The Spirit and the flesh are mutually exclusive; they are contrary the one to the other. On this point there is no difference of opinion. Still it is true that the influence of both is seen in the opposite systems, the influence of the Spirit in the development of religion, and the influence of the flesh, or of corrupt human nature, in the subjective development of Christianity.

All the distinctions between Religion and Christianity which we have now reviewed, fall short, as we think, of the true principle of difference. They all assume a point of observation which ignores the essential nature of Christianity; hence each one affirms something of Christianity, which, with certain restrictions, must be affirmed of religion also. To understand the real difference we need a principle which will enable us to affirm of Christianity what can be affirmed of it only, and to affirm of religion what can be affirmed of religion only. If Christianity be a new creation in Jesus Christ, its nature must differ in kind from the nature of the old or first creation; and it can possess

no essential attributes in common with religion, or with any pagan system. Yet the two can not be sundered dualistically. There must be an intimate connection between religion and Christianity—much more intimate indeed than the distinctions we have considered admit—; for the whole process of Christian revelation goes forward on the assumption of a basis and demand for it already existing in the religious nature of the human race.

The discussion of the positive side of the general subject, however, we reserve for a second article, which, if God permit, shall appear in the next number of this *Review*.

E. V. G.

ART II.—CHRISTIAN UNION, AND THE LITURGICAL TENDENCIES OF THE TIMES.*

ST. PAUL, in his exhortation to unity, says, "there is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." How at variance with this idea, does the visible Christian Church appear when submitted to the most superficial examination! The unity of the Spirit is *not* preserved in the bond of peace, but a number of sects or divisions, all grounding their hopes on the same truths, are battling, with the furious rage of Belial's troops, against

* Anniversary Address on Ministerial Union by T. H. Stockton, Pastor of the Church of the New Testament, &c. Phila. 1859. 36 pp.

Christian Union, and the Protestant Episcopal Church in its relations to Church Unity. By William H. Lewis, D. D,. Rector of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Brooklyn, L. I. New York. 1859. pp. 116.

Mixed Societies, in Principle and in Practice. By the author of "An apology for the common English Bible," (Rev. A. C. Coxe, D. D.). Balt. 1858 pp. 84.

Review of "Mixed Societies." (Anonymous.) Balt. 1859. pp. 45.

each other for things that their honesty forbids them to look upon as essentials. The one body, the head of which is Christ, no longer shows itself as an organic unit, and the one Spirit seems to have assumed a great variety of forms, so that the enquirer for truth is bewildered in his search. Is the ideal unity, spoken of by Paul, not possible on earth, and are we doomed to grieve all our days that the strifes, dissensions and divisions of Christians are more difficult to quiet and to suppress, than those of politicians and mere men of the world? Political parties may be divided by sections and caucuses, but these are readily broken up when a decided and firm stand is required in an attack upon their opponents;—enemies become reconciled, hard words are thrown aside, and a common sentiment of love for, and pride in, their party animates all, so that the contest is active and vigorous. But how often are the good effects of Christian labors made null and void, by the spirit of sectarianism creeping in the council-chambers of the saints, and there contending for its own success rather than for that of the Church Catholic! As much joy (and even more in some instances) is felt in the transfer of a Christian from one denomination to another, from the superintendence of one shepherd to another, as is experienced when a sinner is brought from the paths of worldliness and sin into the walls of the Church. It is said that the different denominations constitute different regiments, all fighting in the great army of the Captain of our salvation, but who ever heard, in a well-regulated army, of desertions from one regiment to another,—of jubilant shoutings and extravagant demonstrations of joy at the increase of one portion at the expense of another? No! regiments, while possessed of a pride which makes them all the more active in time of service, would disdain increase of numbers obtained in this way. They are all contending for one common object, and under one great Commander,—but contentions among themselves, would destroy discipline and subvert all the plans of their leaders.

But Christ, in His ever-memorable prayer for His

Church, prays "that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, that the world may believe Thou hast sent me." Here is clearly embodied the typical condition of the Church, one in itself, one with Christ, so that even the world seeing this unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace, might believe that HE was sent by the Father. Now the present condition of the Church militant, not only militant against the world, the flesh and the devil, but against itself, is far from exhibiting this unity, and one interesting fact is presented to us in the recognition of this abnormal state of affairs by Christians generally. It is the first essential in the right direction, that we should clearly recognize our errors, see how they differ from that pristine condition when the Church, by its united and firm stand against the powers of the world, battled for the truth, in despite of death, life, principalities, powers, things present and things to come, none of which were able to separate it from the love of God as it is in Christ Jesus. Such a recognition of error prepares us for the close consideration of the manner in which we can retrace our steps, and strive after that spirit which, while it will allow *in dubiis libertas*, will require *in necessariis unitas*, and above all *in omnibus caritas*.

Most devout persons are anxious on the subject of Christian union, although we have heard a labored argument, from a Professor in a Theological Seminary, in support of the present condition of the Church, as being *best* adapted for its preservation in purity from the errors that heresy *might* introduce. Such special pleading, in support of *existing* error as a safe-guard against *presumptive* error, is too shallow to require refutation, and few can be found who will cling to it as any defence of division. But although the majority acknowledge the abnormal condition of the Church, and agree with commendable harmony in praying "that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in *unity of Spirit*, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life," and that God would make the Church "strong and mighty

against all heresy and schism. against all error and corruption,"—still the nature of that common platform on which all can meet, is by no means agreed upon with unanimity. Each has his own plan to offer,—each some private conception of the way this great end is to be effected, which *he* considers as failing to be operative, *only* from the fact that the world is so full of bigotry, so opinionated that it will not yield to the suggestions which his mature reflection have produced.

There are, however, several plans of union that have been proposed and have collected around them warm and enthusiastic supporters. A glance at these, and a kind consideration of their defects, and hence, their probable ultimate failure, will not be out of place here.

I. Although Christians are attached to their own denominations, and should labor for the success of these, still they *may* meet on the common ground of the great *Benevolent Societies* of the day. The Bible Society is intended for the distribution of the Holy Scriptures without note or comment; the Tract Society for the publication and dissemination of stirring appeals to the impenitent and lukewarm, and the Sunday School Union for the preparation of proper apparatus to be used in the training up of children to the stature of Christian manhood. Are these great organizations not proper spheres for Christians to labor in, and will not such labor conduce to the tightening of the cords of Christian union? View the religious history of our country for the last forty years, and see whether such has been the effect. Has the number of denominations diminished under the action of these Societies,—have the congregations, whose ministers have been most active in their management, coalesced or united in brotherly love, outside of the anniversary meetings? Such questions are significant and pregnant with importance in the determination of the subject we are now examining. They are propounded without any idea of denouncing these great agencies, but with the view of showing how inadequate these are for the solution of the mighty problem,—

how there shall be a union of that body, which is now so rent and divided. We need organizations for the preparation and distribution of the Sacred Scriptures, for the dissemination of such material as will explain its meaning and publish the loving tidings of the Gospel, to superintend the education of the little ones of this world. They are needed, because the Church, in any one of its present phases, seems to have neglected these duties, and to have indolently folded its hands and waited for some action outside of itself. They can be made better adapted for the purposes, set forth in their constitutions, if the Church will superintend them, will control them, will use them as agencies *through* which she can operate. If she suffer herself to be controlled *by* them, then is harm done, if in no other way, by her loss of power in the carrying out of her peculiar office, as is always the case when control is consigned to other hands than those to which it properly belongs. If the Church was established, on the day of Pentecost, "as the home of Christ's continual presence and power among men," then must she be the prime mover in all operations which relate to the distribution of the Scriptures, to instruction in the way of life, and to the feeding of those lambs, as Christ commanded Peter when he professed his love for the Master. If there be a ministry, whose members are "the representatives of Christ's authority and the ambassadors of His grace," then surely these agencies should be committed to their care, and to their superintendence should the active operations of such Societies be assigned. But here we find the sect-difficulty coming up again, and, in the midst of the hoped for union, there is division; some will not unite in the work,—others require so much to be removed from the pages of Tracts and Sunday-school books that they lose their positive character and become too often of a vague and general nature. The evils are, however, *not* of such a character as to call for the extinction of these Societies, but for their use under the superintendence, control and direction of the Christian Churches, none giving up what it considers vital, but en-

deavoring to supply the deficiencies by the aid of its own ministry, and instead of becoming indolent in the work assigned it, knowing no rest night or day, but laboring to perform its duties in the great vineyard of the Lord. These Societies have not promoted, and are not likely to promote, Christian union,—but have been made useful, and can be made still more so, if the Church will labor to prevent the ignoring of fundamental truth in the effort to be generally acceptable to all parties. They would have no existence in a true, normal state of the Church, nor would Benevolent Societies, Insurance Companies, Alms-houses, City Hospitals and a thousand other charitable plans of the present be necessary, were the Church as it was on the day of Pentecost. They have all sprung up as lamentable proofs of her short-comings, and must stand until the happy day when she is regenerated and disenthralled from the corruptions of ages. If there be evils in these benevolent agencies, let them be removed, and let them be made as useful adjuvants as possible to the Church, but do not let them usurp her place and duties.

II. Christian union can be reached by associations which will have no creed but the Bible, and such bodies can rightly take charge of all benevolent operations; nay more, can perform all the duties of the Christian ministry, save alone the administration of the two sacraments, Holy Baptism and the Lord's Supper. This is the second plan of Christian union, which, in a peculiar way, seems to have been developed from the first noticed. It boasts the uselessness of Creeds,—their *injury* to the cause of Christ, inasmuch as they constitute points around which crystallize, according to definite laws, their adherents, presenting angles and edges sharply set against anything like union. The Reformation in Germany and England is considered as defective in the fact, that it did not throw off the effete creeds of the Romish Church, and proclaim full liberty of interpretation of the Scriptures, according to each man's private judgment. Had this been done, then we should have a *harmonious* (lucus a *non* lucendo, we suppose) Church,

no sects, no divisions, but all agreeing—in what, we are not able to say, except in the right of each man to disagree with his neighbor. The fallacy of such a position is apparent, for even granting that each Christian could thus attain the full stature of godliness, the whole body of Christians would be, when compared with the condition of a Church faithful to a symbol embodying its views of scriptural doctrine, like a vast collection of little shrubs as compared with the sturdy tree whose roots are fastly attached, deep under the solid earth, and whose branches, luxuriating in an abundant flow of healthy sap, afford shade and protection to the weary and oppressed of every clime. Instead of a living organism, the Church would be an aggregation of foreign particles, adhering together with no great force or vital connection.

But throwing aside all considerations arising from a proper estimate of the true idea of the Church, what are the effects of this proposed plan of Christian union? Does the Baptist, who meets his Presbyterian brother on this common ground, waive his exclusiveism and invite him to meet him at the Lord's table,—will he admit him to the privileges which should be the common property of those who acknowledge one Lord and one faith? Here is the test of sincerity—or rather, here is the test of the strength and truth of the so-called Christian union. Will it be said that this is a subject about which all are allowed honestly to differ,—about which peculiar and exclusive views may be held? If so, then is the union, in our opinion, one of form and not of fact.

Again, the Christian ministry is overlooked to a great extent by this movement. The laity are placed in the position of those who have been solemnly set apart from the worldly pursuits of business "to wait upon and serve the Church,—to offer before Christ the prayers and supplications of His people; to feed, to instruct, to watch over and guide the sheep and lambs of His flock, whom He hath purchased with His own blood." Circumstances may arise when a godly layman should take charge of religious meet-

ings, in case of the absence of a minister, although it is even then better that he should be an officer set apart, as the elders and deacons, in many of our churches are, by the public laying on of hands for Church work. But where an effort is specially made to put forward the layman at the expense of the minister, is it not an evil committed against the calling of the latter, against the office which Christ Himself solemnly instituted for the use of His Church? The defence is often made for this course of procedure,—that more good can be done by the layman, and that he is not suspected of interested motives in his efforts to win souls,—more confidence is reposed in him. If this be *so*, then it is high time for the ministry to be purged, and for those who are so peculiarly fitted for its duties to be fairly and in due form invested with them. Is not the possession of such peculiar qualifications for doing good a strong indication of a call to assume the position of a regular leader in the Christian army?

Another objection to this movement towards union, is, that its members becoming restive under authority, are intolerant towards those who are not operating with them in their Associations. While they virtually deny the possession of the disciplinary power to the ministry and church council, as given in those mysterious words of Christ—"Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven"—they act with apparent authority in condemning those who do not use the Shibboleth of their faith as the countersign. Thus prayer was offered for the *conversion* of the author of *Mixed Societies*—a pamphlet taking ground against these Societies—shortly after its publication, at one of the meetings of such an Association. It is not an uncommon thing for the zealous, wherever found, unless held in by wholesome restraints, to forget that charity, which grants to a brother the use of his own religious views, and to pour on his head the condemnation of an enthusiasm that is approximating to bigotry. In the glow of feeling that arises from trust in God, how often are all

intolerant to those, whose stand-point gives them another view of the great truths of religion and their relations to men.

But over and above these objections, is the idea of the ultimate destiny of this movement. Will it swallow up Christian denominations, cause the disappearance of even one of them? We fear not,—one of its principal oracles speaks thus* of "the new converts at Quakertown,—"already forming a true spiritual Church in Christ Jesus, and desiring to know what is now their duty in regard to outward church organization. Over their simple pulpit, it seems, was suspended the ministerial motto: 'For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.' Under this banner, it was stated, they were brought to Christ; and they are ignorant of any other. * * Who shall counsel them to become Old School Presbyterians? or Baptists? or Methodists? or Episcopalians? * * As in the days of the Apostles, the Lord himself is adding unto the Church such as are saved. He makes them Christians, whole Christians, and nothing but Christians. * * They cannot bear the thought of being divided into different Denominations with opposite principles and jarring interests." He further adds, in a note, these significant sentences, which show what *his* views are with reference to "the case at Quakertown." "Surely the whole subject of Christian union contains no simpler question than this :—*How shall New Converts escape Denominational divisions, and remain united as Christians?* Thank the Lord, that this question begins to be pressed upon us!" Here we have the ultimate destiny of this movement, according to the notions of one of its friends,—the establishment of a Church which shall not be denominational but still remain Christian;—Separate from all the present Christian Churches and form another which shall not be fettered with denominational peculiarities. When the good brother succeeds in his Herculean task, he will have

* Ministerial Union, pp. 34 35.

accomplished the greatest paradox of the age, as he will show how addition can be made to the number of sects, without investing the additional one with sectarian character.

III. But a third plan of Christian Union is proposed, which looks more plausible than the two we have just noticed. Let each denomination appoint its best men to meet in solemn, prayerful conference, ready and willing to yield up all non-essentials, and to form a platform, wide and broad enough, to bear all who can be comprehended within the limits of Evangelical Christianity. Let the motto, of such a grand synodical meeting, be "*Charity*," and, under its blessed influences, something may be done towards exterminating the hydra-headed monster—sectarianism. There is that about this plan which recommends it to the kindly consideration of every Christian man. Judging by the results of Conventions, held to settle difficulties between men, companies and even governments, we might suppose that this plan would meet every hope as regards Christian Union. There is a fairness about it,—a freedom from bigotry which is really captivating to the mind wearied with the continuous warfare that brothers carry on against each other. If Christians are in earnest when they express their regret at the distracted condition of the Church, surely they will not object to a series of compromises, which will lead to a harmonious commingling of all sects. But alas! we have learned from experience that, although fair, beautiful and attractive, this plan has never produced any results at all conducing to the end after which all Christendom is longing. No mere system of compromises accompanied by alterations or intertwinings or dovetailings of creeds and symbols,—no merely mechanical plan has ever yet succeeded in bringing together the different fragments of Christianity. Nor is it possible that union, thus produced, can be permanent. There must be a living connection between a Church and its symbol, and no amount of diplomacy,—no amount of legislative tact can destroy such connection with the hope of substituting another.

The attempt in Prussia to consolidate the two great non-Romanist denominations is now beginning to show itself as a failure. Instead of extinguishing the Lutheran and Reformed Churches by the establishment of the Evangelical Church, the result is the establishment of three. Those, whose life-connection was most intimate with their Church symbols, found that this was not transferable. They could no more transfer themselves from it to another than a fish could transfer its sphere of action from water to land. Their whole spiritual being had been adapted to one element, and could not be harmoniously developed,—could not exist at all in any other. It may be said here, but the united Church of Prussia is much greater in numbers than those which thus cling with the warmth of first love to their peculiar symbols,—that these are but fragmentary portions of the great body of Protestants in Prussia, and hence this well-meant effort of the government of Prussia is in fact a success. Still such an answer cannot destroy the fact that the denominational distinctions have not been swallowed up in this effort towards union.

The defunct Triennial Convention of the Dutch Reformed and German Reformed Churches, which promised so much good, is another instance of failure at Church union. The religious bodies, here acting in good faith, recognized the same symbolical book, had many interests in common, were sister churches, reared up under the same teachings, and yet, from the very first, it was evident to the reflecting mind that the Convention-arrangement was something peculiarly mechanical,—it did not involve a life which could manifest itself in the two Churches, as though they were but different branches of one common stalk. After a short existence, this arrangement was severed to the great satisfaction of both parties, who found that no good resulted from it, while it was prolific in the engendering of strife and contention.

For a like reason, the arrangement, by which a quasi-correspondence is kept up between various religious bodies, has been productive of nothing but empty complimentary

speeches and vapid expressions of general interest in each other's progress and history. The delegate makes his appearance and is admitted to a seat on the floor of the Presbytery or Synod, acts as a quiet observer for a few days and then, in a parting speech, presents the good wishes of his denomination and expresses the great pleasure the visit has given him; while the presiding officer, not to be outdone in fraternal courtesy, fully reciprocates every kind thing that has been said and officially begs that the warmest expression of interest, in the welfare of the sister Church, may be communicated by its representative. The meaningless character of this correspondence is beginning now to be understood and appreciated by those who have heretofore been most enthusiastic for it, and it is difficult to find representatives who take sufficient interest to perform the duties connected with their appointment, or even to attend the meetings of the ecclesiastical bodies. This is painful to contemplate, but surely it is better that we should abolish a relation of this kind, if its only fruit is the expression of a string of empty compliments. Let us have active, heartfelt participation, or let there be none at all. Mere compliments are nothing more than mere lies.

IV. The only ground on which Christians can meet is that of an Episcopally ordained ministry. This is urged now with great force by a large portion of the Protestant Episcopal Church of this country, and some are disposed to allow considerable latitude on matters of a rubrical nature, should the ministers of other Churches submit themselves to their ordination. "The Memorial," which was presented to the House of Bishops some years since, gave assurance that the authors were honest and sincere in their expressions of anxiety for Christian union. The House of Bishops adopted the following resolution: "*Resolved*, As the opinion of the House of Bishops, That in view of the desirableness of union among Christians, and as a pledge of willingness to communicate or receive information tending to that end; and, in order to conference, if occasion or opportunity should occur, this House will appoint, by bal-

lot, a committee of five Bishops, as an organ of communication or conference with such Christian bodies, or individuals, as may desire it; to be entitled "The Commission on Church Unity." That, in making the above appointment, it is distinctly understood that the Commission is clothed with no authority to mature plans of unity with other Christian bodies, or to propound expositions of doctrine or discipline." Such a resolution shows that a warm feeling exists in this body, as in all others, with reference to this important subject, although, to use the words of Dr. Lewis, "*Episcopal* ordination is now, and probably ever will be, a sine qua non of union with our Protestant brethren."

Dr. Lewis, in his pamphlet on Christian Union, has set forth at full length, and with a respectful consideration for other Christian bodies, the relations of the Protestant Episcopal Church. A brief examination of the difficulties connected with this plan will show how, in the present stage of the development of the Church, it is not likely to be more successful than the other plans already discussed in this article.

First, let us see the arguments brought forward by its advocates. A few extracts from the pamphlet of Dr. Lewis will furnish these. "It is hopeless to think of a restoration of unity to the rent Church of Christ, until we can be one in regard to the ministry. It is vain to think of the world's conversion till we all become one in Christ. If we could settle upon a ministry which would satisfy all evangelical Protestants, it would leave little else in the way of unity among Protestants and put us in a position most hopeful towards Churches not Reformed." (Page 80.) "The claims of the Protestant Church in respect to the ministry are those which, in the eyes of our brethren, present the greatest obstacle to union with us; nay, they charge us with perpetuating schisms by our exclusiveness on that point. If we are conscientiously satisfied that our claims are of divine right and authority, they themselves must allow that we cannot do otherwise than maintain them. And

further, if by any means they could be satisfied to receive our orders, and the unity of the Church might be restored thereby, then it is their duty to yield to us on this point, even though contented with their own ministry, and the guilt of perpetrating schisms rests on them,—not on us. If we are in conscience bound to our ordination, and they will not undertake to say that it is invalid, it belongs to them to remove the bar to union, by conceding to us a ministry which they with good conscience can receive, and we with good conscience cannot renounce." (Page 64.) "If any denomination were desirous to have a bishop or bishops consecrated from among themselves in our line of succession, to confer orders—if, for instance, the opportunity were now afforded, as when Calvin approved a moderate Episcopacy, and the leaders of Methodism desired it, we trust we could say to our brethren, 'We regard our Episcopate as a gift from Christ to the world; take it from us, and use it with no limitation from us, save that such safeguards be adopted that it be not abused to further heresy.'" (Page 76.)

Now, through all these quotations there runs an assumption that we think can hardly be accepted as susceptible of demonstration, viz: that similarity of ordination is all that is necessary to collect the scattered remnants of the Christian Church. In fact does not experience show, that this is *not* conducive in any marked way to unity. Is not the validity of ordination by presbyters admitted by nearly all non-episcopal bodies, and do not nearly all require that this should be performed with the "laying on of the hands of the presbytery?" With a ministry thus set apart for sacred purposes, so recognized that its members frequently exchange pulpits to the complete satisfaction of their congregations, do the non-episcopal bodies show any remarkable tendency to Church unity? And, on the other hand, are the bodies, who have adhered with zealous tenacity to exclusive episcopal ordination, at all distinguished for affinities drawing them closely together? We trow not. Does the Roman Catholic priest exchange duties and priestly services with

the priest of the Greek Church,—or do the Episcopally ordained ministers of the Swedish Lutheran, the Moravian, and the Anglican Churches, exhibit any tendencies towards that Christian fraternization which would lead us to hope for their union? A negative answer must be given also to this question. If such be the facts in the present condition of those Churches, whose ordination is alike, how can we admit the assumption of Dr. Lewis as at all *axiomatic* in our philosophizing on this subject? Alas! even this slight hope of union is removed from us.

But, assuming that similarity of ordination *would* be promotive of Christian Union, let us now see whether his idea concerning the adoption of Episcopal ordination involves no sacrifice of principle on the part of non-Episcopal ministers, and whether "with *good conscience* they could receive" such ordination. What is involved in an admission of the *necessity* of Episcopal ordination? Nothing more and nothing less than the admission that all ministerial acts, performed by others, are null and void. Admitting the universal priesthood of believers, only the baptismal services of such ministers, as are non-Episcopally ordained, could be recognized as valid. Hence, he, who applies for Episcopal ordination, thereby publicly denies the validity of all the other ministerial services he has ever performed, including of course, as most peculiarly unjustifiable, his administration of the sacred elements at the holy communion. His special priestly functions have been so many evidences of usurpation, which he publicly avows to have been wrong, to say the least, and most probably evidences of sacrilegious desecration. Now it is perfectly clear, that there are few, if any, ministers of non-Episcopal bodies, who would be *conscientiously* prepared to make these admissions,—to avow that they had been grossly in error, even with the hope of thereby promoting, what it is not at all certain could be thus promoted, Christian Union. Such are the insuperable difficulties in the way of the adoption of the fourth plan, which prevent all hope of its ever being considered feasible. Such *re*-ordination would imply the

necessity of a *re*-confirmation of all their Church-members, and, with those whose views are not sufficiently Churchly to recognize the validity of *lay*-baptism, of *re*-baptism, or, at least, of hypothetical baptism of all comprised within their congregations. We submit these difficulties to the consideration of our author, and ask whether we go too far in pronouncing them, *at present*, as insuperable.

It is true that as regards those about entering on the ministry, these objections do not hold with so much force, although even then they would be obliged to submit to *re*-confirmation, which would also imply a desertion of those principles they had hitherto held as precious and true. And young men, who would thus submit to Episcopal confirmation and ordination, would most likely elect the Episcopal Church proper as the sphere of their labors and duties, thus preventing their act having any effect at all upon the very religious bodies intended to be brought into one fold.

But, admitting the necessity of such ordination as directly promotive of Church Unity, and waiving the difficulties mentioned in the last two paragraphs, another question comes up for consideration, Why should orders be obtained from the Protestant Episcopal Church in particular? Might not the ministers of the German Churches, and more particularly those of the Lutheran Churches, say we prefer to have our ordination from that Church which approaches most nearly our own as regards the period of its secession from Rome,—we will go to Sweden, where an undoubted Episcopal succession has been preserved, and, from its bishops, we will ask this privilege, which it is alleged will cause the disappearance of divisions. Or, others of another shade of religious feeling might elect ordination at the hands of Moravian bishops, who claim continuity of succession. Or, others, again, might say, we are worn down by the trials of our position, why not go to the Romish Church, and from its authorities receive that power, which presbyterial laying on of hands will not confer. Is it not very evident that as great contrariety of action,

as this, would be inevitable, even were we to admit the correctness of the author's position.

We are not blind to the great benefits which flow from Episcopal government,—how the office of bishop, in its peculiar sense as confined to one man invested with special powers and privileges over and above his fellow-ministers, may be made conducive to the support of order and discipline, the preservation of sound doctrine and the concentration of the efforts of the Church. We are not satisfied but that much of the trouble, arising from the want of such an office, in the way of the division of the Church into numerous sects, might not have measurably been avoided had its government been more generally Episcopal. We recognize, with hearty good will and thankfulness to God, the wonderful success of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country, and would bid it God-speed in its laudable undertakings, its missionary and benevolent operations. Its past history is rich with the lives of sainted men, whose writings and deeds are the property of the Church Catholic, and its future bids us hope a continuation of its activity and energy. But we can not see how Church Unity is to be effected *now*, through an acceptance of Episcopal ordination, by those who recognize presbyterial ordination as of *equal* validity. The customs and traditions of three centuries, together with the blessings which have resulted from the ministrations of men ordained by Presbyteries,—these prevent this plan from receiving full sanction from non-Episcopalians, and show that it is likely to be of as little avail towards the desired Christian Union as the other three mentioned.

What then! are we to believe, if we admit these plans as not likely to produce Church Union, that there *must* be divisions and sections in the Church? Is there *no* hope of quieting the sect-spirit? Is there *no* hope that the time may come, when, in name and feelings, in word and in deed, we may practically understand and act in accordance with Paul's words: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female:

for ye are all ONE in Christ Jesus?" Yes! there is hope, simply because we are assured it will be so, although there may be much tribulation before such an end is attained. "The actual Church is still very far from being a perfect Church. * * As it now stands especially, the Church, with its divine life-powers, is not confined to any one organization exclusively, * * but extends its presence, with different measures of power, over different and divided communions. It has no sympathy indeed with the spirit of division and sect; but still it allows the evil to be comprehended for a time in the evolution of its life, (just as the abuses of the papacy were comprehended in it before the Reformation,) in order that all may be the more gloriously surmounted in the end."* Such words are cheering to the desponding spirit. They bid us have faith in the Providence of God as His plans are unfolded in the world, faith in History (which is nothing but the revelation of the Divine plans). There can be no forcing History to a rapid exhibition of results,—it is a process, which advances on towards its final completion, under the agency of laws above the comprehension of finite minds. No quickening means, devised by the intellect of man, can hasten this process, which proceeds slowly and measuredly with the dignity and grandeur that specially marks all the works of the Supreme Being. Let us not be disheartened and sicken at the discords of the present; they may all be necessary, as preliminaries to those grand harmonies which shall accord with the hymn that the angels sang, when the announcement of a Saviour was made to the shepherds,—they may all be employed by the Lord to redound, not only to His glory, but to the establishment of "peace on earth, good will to men." We can hope for very little from societies, associations, ecclesiastical conventions, or from the adoption of particular Church doctrines, towards Church-union. These are, after all, minor points. They do not reach the heart of the subject. They are all me-

* The Church, by Rev. J. W. Nevin, D. D. 14.

chanical appliances, proposed as substitutes for that which is organic and living. We must strive to get the Church-life, the Christian faith, that which is embodied in the Creed, and then we shall find differences removed, not by conventional arrangement, but thrown off by the life-vigor that will permeate our organizations. Sects, in proportion as they learn to live and move in the Creed, will gradually approach each other in faith and practice, until at last the division walls will have so thinned away that, with the glad shouts of rejoicing believers, they shall fall, even as the walls of Jericho fell on the seventh day, after having been compassed at first in silence by the people.

In the first volume of this Review it was shown that,* "For the settlement of our existing theological and ecclesiastical difficulties, the first and most indispensable necessity is a true and hearty inward submission to the authority of the Creed, according to its original intention and design. * * The first condition of all sound theology is, active sympathy with historical Christianity, with the idea of the Church, with the Catholic mystery of the Creed. * * We must be in the Creed, and so have faith in the Church, in order to determine it, or to settle its exact form and limits." Here, then, we have an indispensable prerequisite, which, being adopted, removes grounds of dissension as to the *form* of the Church. If the faith be right, there can be no cause for discussion.

It is worse than idle to permit discussion as to the proper form for the actual Church. We are not possessed now with the material for such discussion, and we can only assure ourselves that the form will be such as its nature and uses will require. Dr. Lewis himself honestly admits,† "None of us have a perfect system, whatever its excellencies, and when God shall build up again His one true Catholic Church it will probably be with materials gathered from all existing Churches."

But do the signs of the times indicate anything like an approximation towards union? We think so, and pro-

* I. 344, 345 and 346. † Christian Union. 27.

pose now to direct the attention of our readers to a feature in the present condition of Christianity which is a hopeful indication that the dawn of better things is approaching. And this feature is the wakening up of Christians to a true idea of worship, proceeding mostly from a closer study and appreciation of the Apostles' Creed.

The Liturgical Tendencies of the Times are remarkable, in the fact that they do not rise from any particular local point and then extend by ever-enlarging circles. There is no one *focus* from whence they proceed, but numerous foci—appearing here and there in every denomination in our land. They cannot be attributed to the influence of any one school of theology, but have grown up from the necessities of the case, and have acted upon individuals, whether willing or unwilling, with such power as to cause these to demand liturgical services in some form or other. Those denominations, which sprang into existence under liturgical forms, adopting the old ones, with slight modifications, as their own peculiar birth-right, have returned to their first love, joyously fleeing from the so-called *free* worship of Puritanism to that which is less slavish because the offering of the spirit of every worshipper; and those that have been ushered into existence without such blessed privileges, begin to yearn with irrepressible desire after some liturgical character for their worship, which will enable it to be freed from the danger of taking its character from the physical condition of the minister.

The liturgical tendencies of the Present have been partly occasioned, as a species of reaction from the loose and rhetorical character which public prayers have been made to assume. The idea of prayer seems to have entirely escaped the minds of some ministers, and it is made the means of communicating truths to the congregation, of narrating events and incidents, or exhibiting rhetorical skill and *belles-lettristic* ability. Hence we have the terms familiarly employed on all sides, "*eloquent prayer*," *impressive prayer*," &c., which are specially significant, since they show that prayer is valued by its hearers on account

of the rhetorical dress with which it is clad, and not because it embodies their own sense of sin, deep contrition, humble petition for forgiveness, and thanksgiving for past and present mercies. The heartfelt petition of the publican would be considered, by no means, an *eloquent* prayer at the present day, although our Lord tells us that he went down to his house *justified*.

The distinction between a prayer to the Almighty, and a sermon for the instruction of the congregation, has long since been lost with some, and both assume the character of the sermon. Mr. Spurgeon offers up,* in a prayer, "a petition for Reform, and that Parliament might be enabled not to talk but to do something." But as an illustration of the worst conception of prayer probably on record, we transcribe some extracts from one offered† "on the occasion of the funeral solemnities while the remains of Dr. Kane lay in state in the State Chamber, Columbus, O.," by a minister of the Congregational Church. We feel that we should apologize to the readers of the Review for the insertion of such material, but we wish to give a specimen of the kind of prayer which is esteemed as both eloquent and impressive. * * "We have come hither to pay our last respects to the earthly remains of one of whom when living we all had heard, and whom we had learned to love and revere. Thy thoughts are not our thoughts, nor are thy ways our ways, Lord God Almighty; thou didst hold him in thy hand when wind and waters and all nature were against him. Thou didst bear him through storm, and cold, and darkness, and famine, and fear, and didst set him down safely on the deck of the Release. And when the cheers of his countrymen welcomed him back to the social world of love which they represented, hope elevated and joy brightened his crest. Long had he trod the ice-foot in safety. Through two Arctic winters God had kept him. And in the third under the mild light of a genial clime, before the returning sun had gilded the topmast of the Advance in her ice-bound home, the floes yielded beneath

* Athenaeum. Dec. 26, 1857. † Elder's Life of Kane. 327.

his feet and he passed into the eternal sea. * * * Bear with us, O Lord, if in our addresses to thee we make mention of the virtues of him whose loss we deplore. For he acknowledged God as the author of his powers, and it was a part of his wisdom to know whose gift he was. Much had he seen, and known, and done. His feet had touched the soil of every continent on the globe, and his temples had been laved in the waters of every sea. His life was a voyage of discovery. Already the benefits of his labors are felt, more or less, in every country. His plans were original, and as full of humanity as they were of genius. He had been endowed with superior powers both of mind and body, and where others perished he survived. But the silver cord is loosed at last, the golden bowl is broken, the pitcher is broken at the fountain, and the wheel is broken at the cistern. The dust will return to the earth as it was; but the spirit has returned unto God who gave it. The shades of a more-than-Arctic night have settled on his dust,—a night that knows no day; but the spirit is bathing in the mellow light of day,—a day that knows no night. The Advance is in the ice, the Eric is in ashes, the Hope is on a far-distant shore, the Faith—the "precious relic"—is in possession of his country, and Kane is in heaven. He will need the craft no more, for now he walks with the Evangelists upon the crystal and stable sea." This and more, which we forbear to quote; enough has been given *usque ad nauseam;* what follows borders slightly upon the profane. Who can read this epitome of a gallant man's life and believe for one moment, unless he had been assured of the fact, that it formed part of a prayer addressed by a created being to an *Omniscient* Creator? When such material is offered from the pulpit, who dare wonder, that a people will turn, with anxious longing, to those sublime devotional forms which the early Church employed to address the throne of Mercy, and which, with slight modifications, constitute the Liturgies of the present day.

No one, who has ever studied the subject, will think for

a moment that one's devotion, whether private or public, is fettered by forms. We are raised, by an honest and faithful use of these, to a height of devotion seldom attained by the use of extempore or unstudied sentences. Of course, unless the heart is warmly engaged in prayer, it matters little what may be the words that proceed from the lips,—they are but sad mockery. We think, however, when the body is worn down with fatigue and the mind is affected by this so as to be inactive and sluggish, that forms then can be employed with great comfort. The very effort to appropriate them is comforting to the wearied soul. And in the solemn Litanies of the past how peculiarly appropriate does every sentence seem to be to the case of every one using them,—commencing with the cry for mercy to the Holy Trinity, then the petitions that God would spare us from the just punishment of our sins for the sake of His most precious blood that had been shed for us, that He would deliver us from all spiritual and earthly dangers, from ecclesiastical insubordination, that He would help us and all mankind in all dangers and enable us to triumph over Satan; that He would preserve those who are in especial peril and extend His mercy to the prisoners and captives; that He would defend and provide for those who are orphaned, desolate or oppressed;—what is not included in this grand old form of supplication, and what congregation has ever, with devotional feelings, employed it without being satisfied that no words of their own could so fully express their wants and needs?

Again, we are specially warned against the use of "vain repetitions," (which are indeed more or less common in all extempore prayers) such as the heathen use "for they think that they shall be heard from their much speaking," and told to pray "*after this manner*," and the *manner* is indicated in that grandest of all prayers—the Lord's prayer, short, concise, embracing the whole circle of human wants and epitomizing all that can possibly form the material of prayer,—one of the first things taught the infant at his mother's knee, his companion through life, dearer to him

with each repetition, more and more replete with meaning, comforting and solacing him in disease and distress, and making glad the hour of his departure. And why not? Are not the words those of His Saviour, who hath taught him to call the high and mighty Ruler of the universe—his Father, to whom is ascribed "the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever, Amen." No wonder we are told that "John Newton said, That if he could use the Lord's Prayer, entering into the spirit of every word, he should consider it as the highest devotional attainment of his life." Miss Yonge, in one of her late productions, (we can hardly call them works of fiction,—they are too true to life) sets forth the effects of the use of one petition in this prayer by the hero—a great, Christian soul—when he was suffering from the effects of malice: "as if there was power in the words alone, he forced his lips to repeat,—*Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us.* Coldly and hardly were they spoken at first: again he pronounced them, again, again,—each time the tone was softer, each time they came more from the heart. At last the remembrance of greater wrongs and worse revilings came upon him; his eyes filled with tears, the most subduing and healing of all thoughts—that of the great Example—became present to him; the foe was driven back." Has not many a man just such a scene in his past history?

In the Liturgical services that have been published for the use of different denominations, what is peculiarly remarkable in them all is the tendency to return to the forms set forth in the early Liturgies. These, as is known, were made to rest upon the Holy Communion as the greatest of all forms of worship, and those are now found to make more account of its celebration than was done years since. Committees, appointed to prepare such formulae for public worship, have willingly confessed their total unfitness for the construction of prayers and collects, which shall have the same fullness and devotional sense as those put forth by the early Church, and have felt it their great privilege

to reinstate these in the position they once occupied. Those are mistaken who suppose that *new* Liturgies are new compositions,—they are simply *adaptations* of old forms to the needs and wants of the present. Dr. Lewis has fallen into such a mistake when he speaks thus of the Provisional Liturgy of the German Reformed Church,—"How can those who have prepared it suppose that they, in their studies, can mould a service to be compared with one which has grown into perfectness by the contributions, the experience, the use, the wants, the piety of nearly two thousand years?" The most important portion of this book—the Communion Service—is based upon, not the subjective notions and ideas of the Committee but the ancient Liturgies, as the most superficial examination will satisfy the reader. Besides this, the early history of this Church, after its secession from Romish rule, is peculiarly rich in Liturgies; Leo Juda prepared one in 1523,—others were set forth in 1525 and 1535 at Zurich, and the Palatiate Liturgy dates from 1563. Members of this Church are said to have been active in assisting the Committee who prepared the Book of Common Prayer, as is intimated by Daniel, in these words—Ut vulgo fertur his viris (i. e. the committee appointed by King Edward) non defuit theologorum Reformatorum *Exterorum* auctoritas atque consilium Petri Martyris, P. Fagii ac M. Buceri et Johannis a Lasco.* This is doubted by Weber, who asserts that Bucer and Martyr did not visit England until the book was completed. It is a matter of history, however, that Bucer was appointed Professor of Theology in Cambridge, 1549, and lived two years in the performance of the duties of the chair, and that his body, with that of Fagius (who had left Germany at the same time and for the same reasons"—on invitation from Cramner—)" were burned," being chained upright to a stake in the reign of Mary.† Schmidt, in his life of P. Martyr, mentions that Bucer, in company with Martyr, prepared a critique on the English book, entitled Censura super libro sacrorum. This, along with others

* Daniel. Cod. Lit. 111. 297. † New Amer. Cyclopoedia.

objections, had the effect to secure alterations through a Commission named by the King, and, to use Schmidt's words*—"Den 6 April 1552, wurde diese (the Book of Common Prayer) revidirte, dem einfachen reformirten Typus näher gebrachte Liturgie von dem Parlamente angenommen. Sie war ein bedeutender Fortschritt in dem Werke der englischen Reformation, und ein neuer Beweis von *dem Einfluesse, den Martyr und Butzer auf diese ausübten.*" Schmidt adds—"Die Arbeit Butzer's über die Liturgie war eines seiner letzten Werke." Thus, it will be seen that the Reformers of the Anglican and German Churches were operating, in the early history of these Churches, *harmoniously* in the preparation of liturgical services, and their descendants, employing the results of their labors, should thankfully receive the work of their hands as a most precious boon.

Modern Liturgies, we say, are not modern compositions, nor are they reprints of the Book of Common Prayer, but all base their value upon the early forms which were prepared in those times when the Church was fully infused with the spirit of its Master and His teachings.

Another point in these Liturgies is the fact that they are more or less expositions or unfoldings of the Apostles' Creed. In the German Reformed Liturgy, this venerable symbol is placed *first*, as embodying the sum of the Christian's faith, not as set over against the Holy Scriptures, but as epitomizing that which they contain as necessary for a Christian to believe in order that he may be saved. The Church Book prepared for the use of St. Peter's (Presbyterian) church, Rochester, N. Y., in the morning service, leaves it to the discretion of the minister "to invite the congregation to stand and say with him the Creed of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America, being that commonly called the Apostles' Creed," and requires its use in the administration of the Lord's Supper. The Liturgy of the French Protestant church, Charleston, S. C., requires the use of the Creed in the morning and

* Schmidt's P. Martyr Vermigli, 125.

evening service. The Liturgy, published by the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States, leaves it discretionary with the minister "to pronounce the Creed" in the service for the Lord's day. All these Liturgies thus show more or less tendency, not only in their forms, but in the respect and great account thus made of the Creed, towards Christian Union.

A most interesting publication proceeding from the Unitarian Church, published in 1858, would seem to show that, even there, the members were longing for something more than the dry morality which has hitherto constituted its doctrine,—were desirous of retracing their steps to the cross and *there* acknowledging the man Christ Jesus as the Son of God. We refer to the Service Book published for use in the Chapel of Harvard University. This contains full services for all the festival days, (including saints' days) of the Church year,—the unaltered Apostles' Creed, and a Communion service from the Liturgy of St. James. The mere appearance of the Apostles' Creed in a Unitarian book, is a protest against the system, and is the admission of a glorious light which must increase in brilliancy until it shall bring this body back to the precious truths involved in a recognition of the Trinity. Its repetition, in public service, will surely bring the worshipper to a serious consideration of the difference between his faith and that of the apostles, martyrs, confessors, saints, holy men and women, who while in the Church militant lived and died in full assurance of the truth of the articles of this *Symbolum Magnum*, and who now in the Church triumphant are allowed the privilege of joining the "ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands" in saying "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing." If the Creed had been preserved in all the Churches, could Unitarianism indeed have attained the numbers it now claims? Would it be possible for a people to be led off from the doctrine of the Trinity by any minister, if the Creed were recited at each public service? A child would

see the inconsistency involved, and would detect the erroneous tendency. We are told that "of two hundred and sixty parishes, established in glory in the days of Cromwell, two hundred and forty are now Unitarian," and, sadder still, that the pulpit, from which John Calvin preached to a loving people, now resounds with denials of the Trinity. So long as "the form of sound words" is adhered to, so long will there be very little probability of defection from sound Christian doctrine,—so long will the centrifugal tendency of the sect-system be held in perfect equilibrium by the centripetal force that binds the believer to the great fact of the Incarnation, as beyond all question, that which must never be yielded up even though life itself be the forfeit.

The return to the use of the Creed, not, however, made dependent on the will of the officiating clergyman, but authoritatively required, must, by a natural process, lead to an acceptance of its life and spirit. He, who publicly and with a due sense of its meaning, repeats the article—I believe in the *communion* of saints—must be made to see sooner or later that such communion will not admit of a division of the Church into contending parties, and to feel that existing divisions are wrong and must decrease while the Church itself shall increase.

Liturgical worship not only allows of a more full union, on the part of the people, with the prayers of the minister, but it effectually prevents the injurious effects of any heretical notions he may entertain. The recognition of such will be easy to those who have been trained in forms, prepared in accordance with the early Church customs and formulae. A return to it is a hopeful indication at present. Those, who fear every thing that is Churchly, lest it may be Romanizing, may have their fears dispelled by reflecting on the fact that the practice of the Roman Church, in our country, is to confine the liturgical worship to the clergy and the choir;—these perform the whole service. There is a practical denial of the universal priesthood of believers,—an usurpation tion of the worship, as absolutely from the hands of the

people, as is the case with some of our most unliturgical sects. The use of liturgical services by people and minister is *not* in accordance with Roman Catholic custom, but *is* in perfect accord with the custom of the early days of the Holy Catholic Church, even in its apostolic times. Moreover, the employment of the vernacular for this purpose is especially enjoined by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians, when he exhorts them "to excel to the edifying of the Church," by speaking in "a tongue easy to be understood,"—"Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say *Amen* at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?" (1 Cor, 14: 16.) In the Roman Church, adherence to the Latin service, and the entire use of Liturgical material by the priest and choir, constitute important differences from the Liturgical worship of such Churches as have, under faithful ministers, well-trained congregations joining, with audible voice, in the responses required by the service, thus satisfying the minister and themselves that their thoughts are not bent on criticizing the prayer but on the contents of the same. The criticism of a rough old soldier, in the Light Artillery of our Army, on the difference between a liturgical form of prayer and one of extempore origin, will show in a word the effect of the two modes of worship on the hearer. The regular Chaplain at the post was in the habit of using the Book of Common Prayer,—being obliged to be absent one Sunday, his place was filled by a brother who rejected all such helps as Liturgies might offer. After service one old soldier expressed himself somewhat as follows:—"I don't like that preacher, for when he says 'let us pray,' he means I will pray and you shall listen, but with the other preacher he means exactly what he says." Here was the difference: in the one case the hearer was obliged to use his intellect, and probably found it difficult to avoid criticizing; in the other he could accompany the minister, who was merely acting as the mouth-piece of the congregation.

But we must draw our article to a close. All mechani-

cal plans at Christian Union, have proven themselves unfitted for the great purpose of binding the *disjecta membra* of the Church. There seems, however, to be hope that such an union will take place ; but it must spring from the approximation of religious bodies in life and usages, so that at last, the necessity of separation no longer existing, they must, by a law of their own existence come together and form one harmonious body. To employ the words of an English author : "We can do nothing well till we act 'with one accord ;' we can have no accord in action till we agree together in heart ; we cannot agree without a supernatural influence ; we cannot have a supernatural influence unless we pray for it ; we cannot pray acceptably without repentance and confession." Approximation in life and usages must result from a general and devout use of the Creed with the liturgical services that necessarily arise from its employment. Our Churches at present exhibit a great interest in the subject of Liturgies and their uses, and hence we have endeavored to lead our readers to our opinion, that *in the Liturgical tendencies of the Times there is a faint foreshadowing of future Christian Union.* We cannot force the course of History. We must pray and wait. There is a *vis medicatrix ecclesiae*, which will eventually heal all wounds and throw off all excrescences, drive off morbid affections and restore healthy action. We can be as confident that the Actual Church will at one time fully embody the Ideal Church, as that

> "The saints on earth and all the dead
> But *one* communion make ;
> All join in Christ, their living Head,
> And of His grace partake."

Art. III.—ANGLO-GERMAN LIFE IN AMERICA.

The Anglo-German is fast becoming a recognized element in our growing country. It has characteristics peculiar to itself, which will yet go far toward giving tone and color to that general American life in which it is no unimportant part. Long misunderstood and a thousand times abused by what is, to say the least, no better than itself, it is in our day rising to a truer public estimate of its intrinsic worth. We propose to offer for consideration, some reflections on the Anglo-German element, with respect to its characteristics, numerical strength, and probable future influence.

Rationalism or ignorance, transcendentalism or infidelity, fumes from long pipes and lager-beer are the main ideas suggested to the popular mind, when we mention the Germans and their descendants, in relation to our American life.

The glories of the Fatherland are not known to the American public; especially as now inherited by her sons in the truths of the Reformation and the principles of German arts, science and philosophy. These are largely transferred to this land along with her sons. We are liable to forget the full value of the rich inheritance transmitted to us from the Reformation fathers. By some strange power, something like Circean enchantment, not pleasant but still strong, there is a continual tendency to transform the English grown German into a character, with everything but the Yankee left out. Under the pressure of this general force, it soon becomes fashionable to be ashamed, not only of the noble language of the fathers, but also of their simple honesty of character and homely manners. By the prevalence of Yankee customs, moulded by ignorant prejudices, which derisively calls them "Dutchmen," they are foolishly led to ignore, along with the falsely supposed odium that attaches thereto, the true excellencies of their inherent birth-right.

For the bald assumptions of that would be superior intelligence, which ignorantly mistakes German for Dutch, we have no kind of patience. It may be well passed, once for all, with unveiled contempt. But for those, who make a ludicrous merit of bedaubing their ancestry, in accent that should blister their tongues, if it does not mantle their cheeks with the deep stirred blush, by denouncing everything which reminds them of their origin as "too dutch," we have but sovereign pity. We have seen Anglo-Germans, under a false conception of what constitutes the genteel and respectable, with indignant zeal, repelling the imputation that they understood the language of their fathers. We however honored the warm blood that nevertheless gushed at the same time from a German heart, to attest its duty to its original life. The fifth commandment is not considered here in as binding force as it forever should be.

All this, under one view, is natural enough. For though there be nothing in the German character itself, and still less in its noble language, of which its descendants have true cause for being ashamed; yet there are considerations in some sense calculated to give the blush to those who thence derive their origin. Much of this element appears in our American life in its most ungainly dress. Wild radicalism in politics, mystic transcendentalism in philosophy, rationalism and pantheism in religion, are strongly represented by many of those, who have left their country for their country's good. It were a blessing also to the land in which they now sojourn, if they would do as much good for us. But such do not truly represent the general German life. Scum boils naturally to the top, and is always more apparent than the better contents in the vessel below. We are not the advocate or apologist for that kind of German life—the only kind, by the way, with which the public are acquainted.

However apparent are the more repulsive aspects of the Germanic element among our people, so that it is not failed to be noticed, and even grossly exaggerated and most keenly carricatured, there is, nevertheless, a better side.

This there has been but little disposition hitherto shown to appreciate. Some spirits have their type in those unclean birds which delight to be where the carcass is; while the fresh living forms have no noticeable attraction or desirable value for them. It is a pity when public opinion is made or governed by such.

The true cause for this so common unfavorable view of Germanic life in this country, may, however, be traced far back of the fact itself. First impressions, even though not always correct, yet go far towards making up general conclusions. So doubtless is it largely in this case.

Noticing the ground of this unfavorable judgment, we present it in a twofold form: from which it will be seen how unjust it is, that this should remain now longer in force.

The first reason is found in the native element of the German character itself. It is naturally retiring and modest in its claims to merit. Such are not always the first to be fully appreciated. This commendable virtue, may, however, run, as it oftimes does, into a serious fault of slow motioned dullness and inactivity; which, in a fast age like ours is not only offensive, but will also be left far behind the spirit of progress. In strong and sharp contrast with this retiring modesty of the German, is the assuming and always self-sufficient spirit of the Yankee. This is likely in its smart progress to overflow the German at every point. The good natured, easy patience of the Anglo-German has been so long accustomed to submit quietly to this, that it now readily yields to almost any dictation and pretention for the sake of peace.

Germanic life thus often gives way before the absorbing power of a more aggressive spirit, not because it *could not* successfully resist and show a more excellent way. But it would in the main rather suffer from equivocal shrewdness, than meet it on its own grounds, or contend with vaporing vanity. Boys trained properly by faithful parents, under such a spirit, had rather not be quite so 'cute, as to allow their smartness to run away with their honest integrity,

and destroy their peace of mind. This spirit would rather be duped than resort to counter humbug in its turn. It never plays, diamond cut diamond. It prefers meershaum composure, to the necessity of asserting its own personality in violent contests. This fact has crowded the real deserts of the Germans often into the back ground. Such being the plain fact, as resting in the native element of the German character, it need not be a matter of wonder that the rattling car of Yankee activity, drawn by the locomotive of high pressure volition, should make faster time at its break neck speed, than the calm reflective train of German contemplation. Our fathers never sound a steam whistle to tell of their coming, nor do they blow their own horns, as long practiced by others before the invention of the shrill steam signal. We only refer to the fact here without attempting to justify it under all circumstances. This modesty may hide them in a quiet corner when they should be out at work. As illustrating this retiring modesty in an undue sense, a characteristic anecdote is told as follows: A preacher, in a meeting of one of the German sects that despise an educated ministry, while exhorting his hearers to humility, said "'My friends—I feel so humble, that it seems to me I am just like, nobody—standing on, nothing—and going to jump, nowhere."

The other consideration to which we refer, as being an original ground for the unfavorable judgment that prevails as against the Germans, is the fact that many of the earlier German settlers, as well as many of the later arrivals, were poor. Many of them were sold into temporary service to pay their passage money. But poverty, says the proverb, is no disgrace, though it be very inconvenient. Then too, from the nature of the case, they were an agricultural people. They dwelt in the country, without public institutions and rattling machinery to call attention to their habitations. In their quiet seclusion they would be naturally overlooked. Their presence and even their very existence was hardly ever noticed in local history. This showed at least their peaceable disposition as citizens. They were

not brawling politicians and place seekers ; but had the happy art of being about their own business—which with other good customs, is fast disappearing. For a long time they had no literary institutions, no periodical organs, no printing presses, and theirs was consequently but a limited literature. Their Bibles they brought with them from home, their prayer books were handed down from father to son in their generations, and Dr. Benjamin Franklin, and after him, Mr. Gruber, printed for them their Catechisms and Almanacs. All this was good as far as it went, but it was inadequate to the increasing wants of their descendants in a fast age and growing country. Doubtless they did not understand enough the use of printer's ink. Lack of progress was a grievous fault, and grievously have our fathers answered it.

Like the burning bush, indeed, has the German element been acted on by other influences, calculated to destroy its life ; yet it is not consumed. This alone, were saying at once much in its behalf. The crusades carried on so long against it, have drawn away much of its own proper material, thus steadily exhausting its life stream. Against this there was, for a great while, no remedy—except in the native vigor, which here and there individually maintained itself in the face of all odds, with the most dogged pertinacity. Having been subject to this constant drain upon its strength, by which other interests have been built up, is it not a wonder that its life is not all gone ?

It is about time, we think, that this thing were brought to an end. The German Churches have at length waked up to the necessity of putting a period to this mode of piracy, by which others have fattened from their strength. That there is yet remaining any of the German element, beyond the generation just arrived in the land, is at least a living monument of its own vigorous original constitution. Make the same draft on any other source of American life; take, for instance, its main stem, that of Puritanism ; and the steady drain for more than a century, would sap it dry to the roots, and a certain death would most inevitably follow.

Only allow yourselves to look at the present case fairly for a moment; and the wonder will not then be, that the German element is not more commanding in public acknowledgment now—but that it exists at all as a living fact. For the last half century or more, others from a stand-point hostile to the German character, have manufactured for it its public opinion; have furnished its school books and general reading matter; have given it its systems of education, and teachers to inculcate their principles; have taken the lead in profitable business; have reaped the reward of German industry; and dictated for the most part, its standard of respectability in their customs, maxims, morals and faith. Children of the Germans subject to such influences from generation to generation, must surely have had an over abundance of native stamina not to have been brought entirely to their style of thinking, saying and doing.

Fashion and popular standards of respectability, as we have already intimated, required in its false conception, that they forsooth, give up the simple customs, rustic manners and rich language of their fathers;—and alas, their religion too, had to be made of an order like that with which they were surrounded. They must under the power of the same false fashion, feign ignorance of anything savoring of German, for fear of being nicknamed Dutch. And few had the courage to meet and endure this. Ridicule is a sharp argument, and with many it prevails. In early youth we remember a woman who would turn up her nose indignantly at certain styles of goods "pecause tay're tu tutch."

By means of this pressure there has been drawn from the German life and transplanted into other interests, mainly of English Puritanism, its increasing growth, in force sufficient to render large aid to what might otherwise have a less respectable existence. Others may easily excel us now, when they have robbed us of our armour of strength.

The Anglo Germans noting these facts, are coming now to a consciousness of their own resources, and are turning

hither for the remedy against continued impositions of this kind. Once fairly aroused, you will find the patient endurance of the slow German character covering at the same time, most wonderfully stout powers of resistance. Feeling that they can produce their own business talent, as well as afford the means of trade by their frugal industry, they begin to develop their own resources. Means and ability being present, there is no reason sufficient why their own youth may not become qualified as ministers, teachers, doctors and lawyers, to inculcate, administer and practice the religion, morals, customs and laws of our fathers, as well as form the working bone and sinew of the community.

Look for instance at the vital force the German character reveals. First we have here a physical system capable of great endurance. Its wide, strong chest, large and powerful body, filled with ruddy life, shows the Germanic race to be unsurpassed physically, by any other people. In the German voice there are intonations indicating fulness and strength of character, answering in its rich musical chords to the low melody of the slumbering storm. There is also in it warmth and vigor, revealing the internal depth and manifoldness of the soul-life and mind. No other race have such powers of thought for philosophical investigation.

Purity of the social life, is a marked characteristic among them. High character for chastity as the foundation of conjugal happiness, from the most ancient times, belongs to them. The domestic relations were held inviolate and in most sacred honor. The virtue of their women, secured for them higher respect than was paid to the sex by any other nation. It was not anciently fashionable for them to be any thing else than pure and good. And in our time and country, with all the popular dislikes and prejudices to the contrary, yet are the German girls always, nevertheless, in demand for wives. Their proverbial beauty, health, natural grace, fidelity and domestic economy make them desirable wives, good mothers and queens of

the household for many Englishmen's sons who are ready to change their German maiden names to some of the most pleasant English sounds. "The German woman is all love and gentleness, full of child-like purity, which transports one to Paradise. The English woman, chaste, exclusive, thoughtful, and absorbed in her home affections, so loyal, so firm, and so gentle, is the ideal of a wife. The passion of the Spaniard bites deep into the heart; and the Italian, in her beauty and softness, her warm imagination, often with her touching frankness, renders resistance impossible, and you are enraptuered, conqured. However, if you desire a wife whose soul shall respond to your own by the sympathy of intellect as well as love—who shall renew your heart by a charming vivacity and gayety, a helping wit, womanly words, of bird like songs"—you must choose an Anglo-German girl as well trained in the bosom of a happy American home.

Cordial hospitality too, in its simplicity, was a common trait. To their guests, every thing was sacredly free. Not only the results of their industrious hands in their well stored houses, but also of their deep reflective minds. Their systematic thoughts and theories have often been borrowed by the more practical, and applied to Yankee inventions. Contact with the German mind has been of service to others, in more ways than they are ready to acknowledge.

German honesty, is also a characteristic well known, "His word is as good as his bond," is perhaps spoken with more truth of them than of any other class of men. This fact has been illustrated by politicians, who tell the following anecdote: Heinrich owes Wilhelm $900, to be paid in a year. Having heard of promisory notes, they agree to use one. It was accordingly drawn and signed. Then arose the question who should hold the note till it was fully due. Heinrich thinks Wilhelm ought to have it to show what was due him—but Wilhelm suggests, that as he already knows that, Heinrich should take it so that he would know the time of its payment. This was the course

finally agreed upon; and so Heinrich held his own note till due, when he brought the note and the money and handed them both over to Wilhelm—and there the transaction ended. Who but honest Germans would do that?

Closely allied with their honesty is also their religious character. They have constitutionally a warm and deeply pious life. With them it seldom runs into fanaticism. The Protestant Reformation, let us remind the world, is the birth of this earnest religious life in the German soul. Emancipation of mind and spirit from the despotic thraldom in which it was held for centuries, is due to this outbirth of free thought, proclaiming religious liberty. In no other country could the great Reformation have found all the elements necessary to its success. Men may laugh at what they, in shallow conceptions are pleased to call the vagaries of German transcendentalism; but they are neither as great nor as prolific as the bald isms elsewhere found.

Staid, strong, deep and thorough; calm, modest, just and frugal; industrious, patriotic, warm-hearted, virtuous and religious, are the main characteristics that go to make up the good honest Germans. We cannot but admire them if we once learn to know them. Tacitus, the Roman historian, gives a good account of them already as heathens. Nor has Christianity made them worse. With such traits in the fathers, shall the children in whose veins such blood runs warmly, be mocked into shame at the relationship? Nay, rather let it be cause for honorable joy, that we inherit such virtues.

As more than a full offset to all that we here claim for the German character, the tongue of ignorant ridicule and slanderous detraction, has with much self-complacency been accustomed to lay to their charge the reproach of being "dumb Dutch." The sins of the fathers, in their view, descend to the third and fourth generation—unless the children be driven to renounce all connection with their parentage. It is true, though they are genial and social to a high degree, yet they have not the ready wit and vivacity peculiar to some other nations. There is,

however, genuine German wit. Take for instance the following: Some young bloods bent on sport, passed a German saddler's shop and teasingly called to him through the window, "Helloh, old jarmany! have you got any dog saddles?" "Yes, be sure," he politely answered, "come in, young gentlemen, and try them on."

It were a grievous sin to be truly charged with being opposed to education and true progress. This is laid to the door especially of the Pennsylvania Germans. In a certain sense it is true; but not in the manner and form set forth. New England is in some respects unquestionably far ahead. The German spirit is a slow train. It stands opposed to that kind of progress which is virtually backward, or which runs to ruin and radicalism. It had rather remain in the "old paths" than run into spiritual delusions and infidelity. *Festina lente*, is often the surest speed. To hasten slowly in the end is the best progress. The race is not always to the swift. A conservative element is very desirable, as a check to the wild strides of daring go-a-head-ativeness. Thus we sometimes avoid awful collisions and frightful catastrophies.

It is also true that our Anglo-German communities in the main, felt opposed to the modern common school system, though characteristically did but little to set it aside. They were not opposed to education as such, as has been charged; but against the particular form imposed upon them, they wished to protest. German universities, with their thousands of students—and public schools, after which others model, where all the youth must be taught, are so many arguments to show that the German spirit is in favor of right education.

Long before the godless public schools, with all religion left out, were thought of, in this country our German fathers cherished education. Their school houses and parochial schools along side the church indicated their idea of what the school should be. They wanted real Christian education; if even not so general and thorough it should be of such a character, as not to strike at the foundation

of their customs and religion; and thus rob them spiritually of their children. Their prejudices became deep seated, and led to stubborn opposition and extreme opposite tendencies.

Back of the present system also we may find some reason for their opposition to the public school. More than a hundred years ago it was designed, through the medium of such schools to steal away the children of the German settlers from the customs, language and religion of their fathers. Against this scheme our sterling fathers set their faces like a flint. Their just indignation has come down to their posterity, traditionally from generation to generation, and has stood in the way, doubtless, of many who might otherwise have received the benefits of a more liberal education. Fidelity to the memory of the past cost the children much, and ran out in fixed opposition to all that looked like a similar attempt. The English colonial authorities are much to blame for the hostility engendered and now existing between the two elements. Had they succeeded, the condition of things, it is true, might have been different; but would they be better than if allowed to have been directed in a more natural way. The little country churches and school houses adjoining, indicate the simple piety and elementary training adequate to primitive country life. This, however, has lasted too long.

Now the long slumbering giant is about to arouse. We may soon see manifestations of native strength. The Anglo-Germans are not only able but are now becoming willing to foster their own higher institutions of learning. Our Germanic colleges we may not only live to see barely sustained—but like the universities of the Fatherland, crowded with students. Here may yet grow up seats of learning to equal those of the old world. For if everything on this continent is designed by Providence on a grander scale than in Europe, why must we not make these to correspond with all else?

Here doubtless would be the proper place to speak of the present and prospective strength numerically of the

Anglo-German element. Let us confine this in the estimate to the Germans and their lineal descendents only to the third generation. We do not choose to parade long lines of statistics on this score. It is enough for our purpose to know that the Germans are here in sufficient strength to be reckoned an important element in the components of the whole nation. Germans of foreign birth now living in the different States of the Union, number in round figures a million. Their descendants in the first, second and third generations each, number as many more. So that these form an aggregate of one sixth, or at lowest, one tenth of the whole population of the States.

In making up this rough estimate, we have only to remember that some whole States, as Pennsylvania, and perhaps Wisconsin, are prevailingly of this class of citizens. Besides, Germans and their descendents are numerous in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, Texas, Virginia, and more or less in all the other States, not excepting those of New England. Nearly all the large cities and towns have from one tenth to one third of their population of the same kind. In the East, in the Middle States, in the great West, and at the far South—all over our mighty country, you will now find the German and his offspring, frugal, industrious and often enterprizing. In their settlements, you will always find the fruits of solid worth and economical thrift, which have done more to develop the rich native resources of the land than any other class of citizens. Read the signs of our most substantial business firms, and you will be astonished to find so many of them strongly marked with German characteristics. Many of them, it is true, have lost their primitive form, but you can nevertheless trace them to their origin. Some who are several generations removed, would probably be no little surprised to have the signification of their name given them in English, which is the only tongue in which they could now understand its rendered meaning.

Were anything like an accurate estimate made of the Anglo-German element, it would be astounding to them-

selves—and still more to those who have considered them hitherto as no-bodies—with no stand-point and no tendency. Along with these would be found also many Hugeunots, who, having passed first into Germany, finally migrated, as Germans, to this country. In number and influence these are quite respectable. This may help us at least to cultivate self-respect. And if we once come to respect ourselves properly, others will soon learn too to bestow it where it really belongs. The keen scented politicians already are disposed to acknowledge it.

Short-sighted demagogues, in a truly Know Nothing spirit, for a while did ride the hobby of opposition to the Dumb Dutch. They not only hated the fathers, but could see sourkraut sticking in the children's teeth, to the third and fourth generation. But it is truly wonderfully refreshing to note the change that has come over the spirit of their dream. The newspapers are trying to tickle the intelligent German friends and fellow citizens—so the matter runs—with an acknowledgment that they are the best educated class of men in the land, who understand rational enjoyment, who love liberty, who are exact in dealing, who are honest and reliable for conservatism, and essential to the success of the right party. For the proof, examine almost any of our leading papers.

Whatever we may think of the fact, it is now beyond dispute that Lager and pretzels by no means depend for their market value alone on Teutonic patronage. And still more be it known, that some even fashionable and respectable (?) people have learned; that, as eating potatoes does not always make an Irishman, so too just as little danger is there of becoming a German, if cheese be a part of the diet—or of being metamorphosed into a full grown Dutchman if they should dine on turkey and sourkraut!

During the past there has been undisguised distrust of German literature. But a marked and favorable change in its behalf is now rapidly going on. German learning is now an acknowledged and felt mental power in the general life of our country. Its salutary influence is held in

high respect and honor, wherever rightly known. The prevailing sentiment is certainly not that of its former hostility.

Every one pretending to the rank of a true scholar, must now cultivate an acquaintance more or less thorough with German authors in the main departments of science. Wherever the German mind comes into contact with earnestness in others, it starts inquiry, it awakens thought, it invigorates mental life. It is now in its best sense, working wonders in this country.

Much of Germany's best products has been transferred to our soil. In all the broad fields of varied science, are found these contributions of ripe scholarship, taking high rank. Nor are they more prolific than exhausting in their fulness of research. Metaphysics here finds a solution for its profoundest problems. The hidden depths of philosophy have been fathomed, as no where else besides. Theological science owes much to the bright genius of the German divines. The true faith with them has more than mastered the rationalism of the age. It has checked the bold advance of infidelity that for a while threatened the world. The orthodox teachers combatting successfully the false spirit of the times, have won trophies for the truth, which the world is glad to acknowledge and admire.

Results like these, cannot be long overlooked by any honest seeker after truth. No man, we may say broadly, can grapple with the earnest and profoundly significant problems of the age, with any tolerable show of mastery, who has not armed himself with the best provided means of defense. Philosophical and theological truth finds its best weapons, stamped with the impress of German mind. Some of the greatest inventions too of modern times, we inherit also from the same source. The Queen of the arts, the art of printing, and book making belongs to Germany as the land of books. In fact it is the home originally, not only of many sterling citizens of this Union, but also of many of our other blessings. Its poetry and music is now largely transferred to this land of the free; where its Aesthetical

products in the original and in translations more or less excellent, are moulding the tastes of thousands. The same remark is also true of the best works we have on theology—in exegesis, dogmatics, polemics, and history. The foreign theological library published by the Messrs. Clark of Edinburg, Scotland, it is worthy of remark, is without exception, translations from the German. From no other, has there yet been a book found worthy a place in the series. So too, the best works we have on criticism, history of philosophy, philosophy of history, antiquities, and the like, are derived from the same quarter

Knowing such facts as these, it is a plain duty, to make some proper account of this German element in American life. If it be true that our country, as has been supposed, is to be the grand theatre, on which, the errors wearing the grey marks of centuries, are to be met and vanquished, how immensely important then is it not, that we be furnished with the best means for success. The superficial and ignorant, who are ashamed to use the Germanic element of strength may be all the more easily met and overcome. For no vain purpose assuredly, has Divine providence concentrated here so powerful an element as that we are now considering.

Very properly, we may be allowed to say here, most distinctly, that we would not be understood as claiming in any way for this German element anything like a clanish character. It should by no means be kept apart from the other elements of our nationality, as a seperate item by itself for independent purposes. Any such selfish idea, and any movement looking in this direction, we conceive to be both false and wrong. To try to effect this, would be to betray the whole interest. Should it unfortunately be led to do so, it would find itself shorn of its locks, and bound by its enemies, for certain doom in the grinding mill.

Nay: its strength lies not in a life seperate from the general body. Just as little will it be able thus to be use ful, as its misguided enemies are able to destroy it entire-

ly. Neither is its mission, to Germanize the United States,—even were this within the reach of its possible power. They greatly err, therefore, who either vainly suppose, or teach, or practice, as its best means for self-preservation and effective influence, the necessity of the German arraying itself against the English in a hostile attitude. Rather in the bosom of a common life, formed by the harmonious and free blending of all the elements entering into our American society, are the German and English, to find their congenial union. This is at once true for the social, political and religious life.

Untold self-inflicted wrong then does the German suffer, if lead by some demagogue, who would be a champion in Church or State, it refuses stubbornly to form a free union with the general life. By such a union, it by no means loses its distinctive power and beneficial influence. We want the German spirit to be an acknowledged constituent in the American life. Of course, where the other elements do not so acknowledge this as a proper and important part of the whole, their must be collision, more or less violent before a union can at all take place.

Plain illustrations of this are found in communities and Churches. Where the two elements have been at war, under the false impression that there were two opposite interests to subserve, neither has prospered as they might have done in full harmony. Nor are their results in the sum what they would have been in real union for mutual support.

Just let us note, that language and spirit may be distinguished. Cases may occur, for instance (as pratically they often do occur,) where the contest is between the two tongues more than anything else. The English is, and of course will be, the recognized language of the land. In this the laws are made and administered. The public schools too are mainly in this dress. Though in them may be taught Latin, Greek, French and German, still they are prevailingly, and very properly too, English. But though

the German language must be mainly given up in the second and third generations, and no longer authoritatively used; yet the spirit and life may remain as strong as before, and be cherished for its excellent virtues. The question then practically forces itself home to the Germans and their descendants—Whether they had not better give up the language, where historical necessity makes the demand, and retain the genial spirit, than be driven to a war of extermination, and being inevitably fought down, sooner or later, lose all? It is well to make terms with the adversary while in the way.

This Anglo-German literature, science, philosophy, theology and poetry, of which we have spoken, is working its way powerfully into the life and habits of the land. While it remained purely German, all must see that it must of necessity have remained at the same time circumscribed in the limits of its influence and results. But to do its best work it also must become Anglo-German, i. e., it must drop the German language, retaining, however, its spirit. It is not every man, though he even love the German language, who would threaten to attain a knowledge of it, at the expense of all the hair on his head, (as we once heard one say,) in order that he might commune with German minds.

Dr. Rauch's great influence as a philosopher, does not lie in his deep cherished love for the German language exclusively; still less was its peculiar strength found in ignoring that altogether, and turning thoroughly English. But rather he becomes greatest, in giving the combined results of both brought together in a living harmony—though perforce it was in an English dress. To write in English, successfully, with all the advantage of a German standpoint is then possible. This is much better than translations. But even these, if tolerably well rendered, are of great service to the English student. Anglo-German is practically better, than is either, seperately considered.

Had Dr. Schaff, as some desired, undertaken, as a theologian, to Germanize the Church in this country, it must

have resulted in a most signal failure. So will all such efforts in less able hands, a fortiori, always prove. Or, had he become so fully English as to lose sight altogether of the German, he might have given us, as puny results as the dwarfed things we meet elsewhere. He is certainly a more brilliant scholar, leaving altogether out of view his greater usefulness, by being Anglo-German, than if only one of these.

Then look again at the astonishing results of the German element in harmonious contact with the English mind. Take, for instance, what Dr. Nevin in the English tongue has given us from a German stand-point. He might have been great, after the order of Presbyterian greatness, even among their greatest minds, without the additions he obtained from Germanic culture. But when he made the vast lore of that broad field also his own, this element infused into his extraordinary powers of mind a giant strength, by the force of which he towers aloft, head and shoulders, above any living American mind. In after years, when they shall repeat "the few immortal names that were not born to die," his shall be mentioned with the remark, that there were "giants in those days." Perhaps the time is not far distant, when it will be considered one of his most lasting glories, that he taught us to value aright the significance and importance of the German element in our ecclesiastical life. Largely what we are, we owe to him.

It is wonderful what a force is acquired in the Anglo-German combination. Retaining for the most part its original German depth, inwardness and thoroughness, it secures also the vigor, activity and executiveness of the English. It is not a small contribution Germany thus makes to American life. At the same time, it is worthy of remark, that there is a wonderful affinity in the American mind for German thought. It is ripe to receive products of this kind. Could this be infused into New England Puritanism, it would serve to complete its many excellencies. A mighty revolution it would bring about in

its character—not in the way of Germanizing it do we mean; but by giving it an element of positiveness in faith and philosophy, which would fill a felt want in their eviscerated systems of thought. Error and infidelity are making sad havoc of their orthodoxy. There is a loud call for something to check these inroads made upon their materialistic faith. In the German element of this country, we believe, there is the needed remedy.

You have in your very midst, one who was converted to the Christian faith, from the ranks of New England skepticism, by being providentially brought into contact with the theology of our Church, as represented by Dr. Nevin. And there are many such whose hungry souls cry for that better bread. They have gone from their eastern homes into the broad west; where, tired of the emptiness of an emasculated system of doctrine, they must become infidel, if not rescued by a positive teaching that offers real contents for faith. Already do we see evidences of this, in the hearty responses of earnest souls, that welcome the truth. If we are true to our mission, many in the wide west, the future of America and the world, will feel the blessed influence of positive faith brought to bear upon them. Our stand-point must in the end command the rank of high respectability.

Our literary institutions of Anglo-German spirit bring telling influence to bear on American life. The institutions at Mercersburg and Lancaster are strong; powerfully affecting the literary and theological life of the land, because they combine these elements of strength. Heidelburg may gain strength in the same way. Any attempt, however, to make it exclusively one sided, will cripple its usefulness in the great work. Besides ours, other institutions are also making more account of the German as a complement to the English, than formerly. Gettysburg has founded a German Professorship. Princeton and Andover also are drawing strength from German thought and mind.

Not only in our own land, but also in England and

Scotland, learned men are beginning to know and appreciate the advantage to be gained from this source. If thought rules the world, certainly the solid phalanx of homely truth produced by the German mind will go largely towards modifying this power. It is already acknowledged, in the fear, that has arrayed other systems against it. While it overwhelms those empirical and shallow systems of materialism, it brings its own antidote for rationalistic heresies, and transcendental nonsense. That *it is a power* is beyond dispute. The problem now is, to turn it to the best advantage of our American nationality.

Blinded prejudice may ignorantly deny the just merits of the element under consideration. Presuming upon itself estimated superiority, it may proudly refuse the girdle of strength, which the German element brings to its aid. The contest with error may be vauntingly undertaken, unconscious of the weakness of empty pride and vanity. It is, on the other hand, just as foolishly unbecoming to make too much account seperately, of this one interest, in our domestic, literary, and religious life, or in the civil polity of the country. Without at all undervaluing other great interests held in common, we may, however, simply claim for this one important element such just consideration, as shall honestly note its virtues, acknowledge its strength and rightly direct its influence. This much at least our self-respect and self-preservation requires.

Wherever it prevails, it may easily be distinguished by its own peculiarities. Those who want to find it, will see it in the names of our people, in their peaceable lives, in the well tilled land, substantial barns, comfortable houses, good plain manners, simple honesty, industrious thrift, and domestic happiness that mark their homes. There health, wealth and prosperity abound: and with few artificial wants, they are for the most part, in their Christian homes, neat churches, and parochial schools, heartily content. Here is a fountain, whence streams of influence, in its happy home-life, rich literature, and higher institutions of learning, will flow in unobtrusive silence, refreshing and gladdening our land.

Like the streams that irrigate the valleys in the dry summer, along whose courses the green growths show a life-giving freshness, flowing silently—so let our lives be, in the great American nationality. You will find that it is a grand thing to be young men, living in the age and land in which we dwell. We trust you will be so trained in this institution, that you will imbibe the best results of the Anglo-German mind. Make then, its sound philosophy, its pure morality, and its true faith, be in the affairs of life, a sure pledge of glorious triumph.

G. B. R.

Art. IV.—FAITH AND KNOWLEDGE.

It is said to be a fact, well established by trial and experience, that no college or university has ever been known permanently to flourish without having been under the care and control of some branch of the Christian Church, or at least under the guardianship of Christian men.* We find, too, that smaller literary institutions are generally established and conducted by Christian men. Our State Normal Schools also find it necessary to recognize Christianity, at least so far as to keep up public prayers and the reading of the Holy Scriptures. Even our Common Schools, though the State recognizes religion only in the most general way, feel themselves constrained under the pressure of the Christian spirit, in many things to honor Christianity. All this indicates most clearly the prevailing feeling that mind *alone* cannot be recognized in education;

* The celebrated University of Virginia, which in its first intention was to exist on a basis which entirely excluded Christianity, though enjoying the richest State beneficence and influence, has been compelled to change its character, in order to raise it from the effete state into which it had sunken.

but that the leaven that must work in all life, the salt of the earth which alone can purify and preserve, the light of the world from which all else is bright only by reflection, is deeply felt to underlie all mental vigor and development.

It must be evident to every reflecting mind that the religious element must underlie the true development of our entire human life. If this is not a necessity, then Christianity can not be what its very nature implies—the first, deepest and ultimate need of man—that which even heathen endeavors, however unconsciously and blindly, show to be regarded by man in his earnest moods as his most absorbing concern—that which no denial or ignoring of its claims has ever succeeded in irradicating from human consciousness.

Man is a unit—a single whole; but his unity of being is made up of three departments: physical, intellectual, and moral—body, soul, and spirit. By means of his body he is allied to earth, the physical world, through the senses; which is his lowest side. By means of his spirit he is allied to the supernatural, spiritual world, through his spiritual faculties, or senses; this is his highest side. Between these two lies and acts the soul, allied to both. This triune view of our nature corresponds with man's original creation from earth up, as to his body, from heaven down as to the image of God in which he was made, and the breath of life by which he became a living soul. It is the view which pervades the entire thinking of St. Paul—which is found in the teachings of the Fathers*—and which characterizes all modern Christian philosophy.

Now, this being the true view of man, it is clear that the highest is the controlling side of man's nature, and that from it must come the power of elevation to the lower. The true development of our life, therefore, requires its

* "There are three things whereof man consists, spirit, soul, and body; which again are called two, because often the soul is named together with the spirit; for a certain reasonable part of the same, which beasts are without, is called the spirit: that which is chief in us is the spirit; next, the life whereby we are joined unto the body, is called the soul; finally, the body itself, since it is visible, is that which in us is last."

Augustine's Short Treatises, pp. 33, 34.

basis to be laid in the spirit—in other words, it must begin in religion.

Thus we get to the root of a most fundamental and pernicious error in regard to the true principle of education. That which elevates mind above spirit, puts knowledge before faith;* thus separating knowledge from faith; whereas faith goes always before knowledge, underlies it, and is its true mother, according to that profound motto of St. Anselm: "*Neque enim quaero intelligere ut credam, sed credo ut intelligam.*" I do not seek to know that I may believe, but I believe that I may know. We become first good, and then wise. Goodness is greater than wisdom—and what passes for wisdom, when not under the control of goodness, is nothing but a gilded vanity, or, if we may so say, a splendid sin. "The fear of the Lord is the *beginning* of wisdom." This is a divine principle which stands forth as a bold and immovable rock legitimating and vindicating itself as truth in the history of human development—a monumental column in honor of religion in the world's intellectual and spiritual progress, rendered more sublime and alone by the wrecks of broken systems which lie scattered around it.

As the principle that Christianity must underlie all mental development, that faith must precede knowledge as its mother and nurse, strikes at the root of every false system and idea of education, it is worth our while to endeavor to set this truth in a clear light before us, by persuing a line of argument and illustration by which it may be most firmly and incontestably established.

We begin by founding an argument on the relation already indicated of spirit and soul in the constitution of our nature. We have said, in a general way, that the spirit, the higher, controls the soul beneath it. But we make this clearer by noticing the ruling faculities of each. The

* It will of course be understood that we do not refer to merely historical faith, but to subjective faith in the form of repose, trust, reliance, confidence, which is in us the active appropriating organ by which our union with the saving life of Christianity is effected, and the objective supernatural power of salvation is actually made our own.

will is the ruling power in the spirit, and sovereign over the whole man. The will is moral, not intellectual. This is evident at once from the fact that persons of very inferior intellect, or intellectual developmant, are often found to have stronger and better wills than others of stronger and more cultivated intellects. The will is the master motive power, and acts alike to impel men in the right or in the wrong, in truth or in error, in the evil or in the good. Hence the will controls the understanding—is its master, and it rules according to its own character—if good, for good ; if evil, for evil. The will, though fallen, is still the sovereign ; and if not first set right by grace, will sink the whole realm of being over which it presides down to its own degraded level.

We have said that the will is moral, not intellectual. We now add that the understanding is intellectual not moral. It has no power whatever to command the moral. How often do we find that the understanding sees the right, when it has no power at all to bias or bend the will in its favor. All men know better than they find the moral power to do. The intellect that sees the light, still needs the master will to direct and impel toward it. No improvement of the intellect can, of itself, in the least strengthen the power of the will for moral purposes. The most exalted intellects the world has ever known, have been, in all endeavors after moral control and elevation, as a man without nerves. The will made healthy by grace, alone is that self determining power, in which man's individuality and freedom centre. This is the sovereign on the throne of our entire being, reigning with undisputed sway over all the faculties of the mind and members of the body. Here then must begin all elevation—an elevation that has, and must have, its basis in grace, not in nature,—in faith, not in knowledge. Upon this Hermon-summit of our nature must the vivifying showers from still higher sources first of all descend, before streams of life and refreshing can flow down into the vallies, and run among the hills of the intellectual and physical realms which lie on a lower range of our being.

Thus, then, that which is highest and first in our nature, must be highest and first in its education and proper development. Faith must underlie and precede knowledge.

An examination of the manner in which the human spirit is actually developed from infancy up to the fullest self-concious perfection illustrates and proves the same relation as existing between faith and knowledge. Take a child. How is its nature developed? What is the process, what the order, and what the history of its development? Does not that part of its nature which more directly and most deeply forms the basis for religion, mature and show itself active first? Is it not the habit of its spirit to believe what it does not, and cannot as yet understand? Are not dependence and repose in others its earliest activities? Is not the whole bias of its training such as cultivates first of all dependence, trust, faith?—and is not this so necessarily and properly? Could it be otherwise? Would its constitution, and its relation to others, make any thing else possible? Certainly not.

Moreover, how beautiful is the life of childhood in this very habit of implicit trust where it does not, cannot as yet understand. In regard to the needs of its physical life it follows instinct, not knowledge; and in regard to its higher interests it believes and acts on authority and not on understanding. As little as it can know how its life is fastened to and bound up with, the maternal bosom on which it hangs, in such trusting and satisfied dependence, so little can it know, by any intelligent apprehension and conviction, the reason and ground on which rest those teachings which give bent and bias to its spirit, and determine its thoughts, habits, and life. It grows a parasite on the parental stem —looks to them, and trusts in them. It learns first to believe and confide—it will learn later to understand and know. So clear, so proper, and so beantiful is this, that according to our Saviour's deep words, even such as have attained to any degree of self-concious intellectual maturity outside of the power and grace of religion, and without its pre-bias, and have thus left faith behind in their devel-

opment, must undo their life, count what was gain to them as loss, and receive the kingdom of God as a little child. They must become fools that they may become wise. They must become as babes that they may first of all receive the sincere milk of the truth, and thus pass forward according to the true order and in harmony with the true laws of spiritual development, from faith to knowledge.

Thus in the very constitution of our being, and in the order of our development as it there lies, we behold incontrovertible evidence that the cultivation of our religious nature must underlie that of our intellectual nature, and that thus faith is in order before knowledge.

We are led to the same conclusion by a view of the relation which Christianity has sustained and does still sustain to intellecual develepment in the world's history as a whole. As we have found that faith is before knowledge in the order of individual development, so we find that Christianity also precedes it in the intellectual development of the race.

That Christianity is the light of the world our Saviour has pointedly asserted; but history most clearly confirms His divine words. Civilization is not first, and unto Christianity; but the reverse. The history of missions, both ancient and modern, have established the fact that the method of success among the heathen, is not by the endeavor first to educate intellectually and civilize, but that these are results and fruits of their being won to simple faith and submission to the Gospel of Christ. All attempts to prepare them for faith in Christ by preparatory mental culture has been lost time and failure. The faith finds lodgment in pagan hearts, and indeed in all hearts, as good news, simply announced for faith, and commended to every man's conscience and sense of want. Self-conscious knowledge must grow forth from this germ. Though the history of missions has forced this truth upon the most earnest minds, yet are many slow to learn it; because the error which prevails mostly in practice, rests on

the same popular mistake which underlies the wide-spread false ideas of education now in vogue, and arises from the unchurchly and unsacramental spirit of the age. Men will still seek to educate nature into grace, instead of seeking to sanctify and glorify nature in grace; thus ever putting first what God has put last.

Nothing is more clearly decided by the testimony of history than that Christianity is the mother and nurse of science. Colleges and universities are a fruit of its growth, not its cause. The highest philosophy is Christian philosophy. The highest poetry is Christian poetry. The highest order of music is sacred music. So of painting, sculpture and architecture. So of history. What comparison is there between history in which the divine factor is most prominent, and that in which the human factor prevails. What a dignity, elevation, and glory has Christian as compared with pagan history!

Does any one think of Greece and Rome as furnishing examples of civilization, intellectual elevation, and historic glory independently of Christianity? We answer, Have not time and truth shown all these achievements to have been without the element of true life and permanency? The nations sank under them, and, with its empty glory, faded away. Grecian beauty was as the beauty of a bubble, and Roman power as the arch of a bubble, unsustained by heart or centre; both broke and vanished. It was the glory of a whitened sepulchre; deadness was within even while there was beauty without. As there was no true life, there has been, there can be, no resurrection. Nor did it die as the seed dies, by giving life to a greater and better than itself. From its ruins, Christianity rose in the vigor of a new creation. It has redeemed the human spirit from the polished tomb to which Grecian and Roman civilization and science had consigned it. It has taught the nations to yield to the moulding power of a unity and a progress, higher, broader, and more permanent than nationalities; and has carried away victoriously the history of the world after the cross of Jesus Christ!

How plainly does this show that Christianity alone gives vigor to science, civilization, and history—alone sanctifies these, and elevates them to their high and noble ends.

Every theory of education that does not make Christianity its main basis must be false, because it overlooks the fact that man is a *fallen* being—having a depraved nature—by reason of which his entire spirit has a false bias, and his whole intellectual nature is brought under false tendencies. Hence Christianity presents a theory of education peculiar to itself. It does not allow for a moment the idea that the mere development of our nature as it is, can be of any advantage to us, or that we can attain the true ends of our being by merely natural helps. It proposes the education of man in grace. Hence the commission to teach the nations is given to the Church. Before our Saviour authorizes any one to "feed His lambs" or "feed His sheep" He first asks him with repeated emphasis, and with searching solemnity, "Lovest thou me?" Through the entire Epistles of the New Testament are testimonies the most earnest against the wisdom which is merely of this world and carnal in its basis; and they are, in their entire spirit, a commentary on the words: "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom." (Cor 1. 19–21)

Nothing can perhaps better illustrate the one-sidedness and false character of merely secular education than the etymology and radical meaning of the words by which it is commonly designated.

Consider the word education. It is derived from *educo*, to draw out. To draw out what? That which is in man. But what is in man naturally? A depraved nature—prone to evil. To draw out, and develop that, is to create a greater evil. "Educated nature is educated vice."

The old prejudice against education—so largely attributed to the Germans,—that education makes only greater rogues, is in fact a deep truth as directed against education which has not the life of Christianity underlying it. Our fathers who shared this sentiment were far from being op-

posed to education as such. They loved an educated ministry, and had profound respect for educated men in the literary professions, and in the service of the State. But it was education sanctified by the Christian life, and consecrated to high, honest, and honorable ends, which they honored with a deference not a whit behind that of any people.

But they saw, too, that, when religion did not underlie education, then the smarter the man the greater the rascal, and the more dangerous his influence. Were they not correct? Are there not thousands who would do less mischief if they knew less? The fact is, the development of a natural man's intellectual nature is the mere increase of an evil power in his hands. "Knowledge is *power*"—nothing more—it is not goodness, not piety—it is mere *power*, power for good or power for evil, according to the spirit of him who wields it. It can defend the right better; it can also defend the wrong better. It can more powerfully influence others for good, but also for evil. It will enable him the better to preach a sermon, or deliver an infidel lecture. It will fit him to manage well a business, or to manage well a defalcation. It prepares him well to count, or well to counterfeit. Do we not clearly see that the mere drawing out of his intellectual powers is the mere development of a fearful power in man; it is a glorious power, only when the Christian life underlies and directs it. Would it not have been better for the world if such men as Paine, Voltaire, Rosseau, and scores of others, had never learned the alphabet; and are there not men around you who are only the worse for their smartness?

It is not mere education we want, but Christian education—not educated men but educated Christian men. But how can you have these unless you make the Christian life and spirit the basis of all mental development? Blame not honest Christian men, as our fathers were, for being unfavorable to that mere secular education, which on a natural basis, and by mere human appliances, nurses depraved natures into smarter human devils—which only enables

them the better to make counterfeit notes, quack medicines, wooden nutmegs and wooden hams, and in general to inaugurate subtle schemes of fraud and rascality. Educate men in grace, instead of in nature—make provision for the spirit as well as for the intellect in your schools—let Christ, and Paul, and John, be heard, as well as Masters of Arts; let there be praying as well as parsing—let the language of Canaan be taught as well as the language of Homer and Virgil—let the Holy Spirit breathe in and around the teacher and the taught as well as the spirit of science—and good men, however uneducated themselves, will hurry their sons and daughters to your Halls of learning.

Again, it is called *training* the mind. But this represents merely the appliance of outward care—as that which is done to vines, plants, and trees by pruning and directing the growth. But this does not at all reach the depth of the want. It takes for granted that the natural growth and development is good and needs only outward regulation. But here an unchristian basis is assumed. The evil nature of man is overlooked. Can you cultivate grapes by training thorns, or figs by pruning thistles. So, can you truly educate an evil nature into a good and fruitful life by mere outward training. Samson's locks may be cut, but thereby the strength of his nature is not rooted out, nor the vigor exhausted by which his hair will grow again. You may bind the man possessed among the tombs with withes and chains, but the maniac strength within him is not subdued by such outward regulation. So you may trim, and regulate, and train, by outward educational appliances, the natural man, but you reach not the seat of the want, nor secure his true development. You may train evanescent graces to cover the evil beneath, as flowery vines grow over ruins—but the ruins are beneath nevertheless, and only, by being covered, a better abode for hissing and horrid creatures.

How inadequate is the idea as it underlies the word *training* to represent the true, full idea of Christian education. What a false idea of education does it cover! And

how clear is it that an element far deeper than it recognizes is needed in the true development of our nature. It is the Christian element that is wanting.

We have also the word *teaching*, as representing what is needed in our mental development. This is the mere presentation of truth and duty to the mind of another. This is as if giving water and air to a plant were sufficient without any reference to the life of the plant itself, and the soil in which it is to grow. Something must precede teaching. Hence our Saviour, commissioning His disciplea, instructs them first to "make disciples" of them, and then teach them. Of what use are precepts where there is neither the will nor the power to practice them; as little use, yea, as real an injury, as the communication of food is to a stomach which has not the power to digest and assimilate.

Even so far as teaching can call forth action from the taught it can only be of the kind and character of the teacher, as water only rises to a level with its source—the teaching making the pupil good or bad as it itself is. If he is taught error he is made worse; and if he is taught truth, there is no power in that teaching itself to dispose him toward it, or to give him the power to use it as a blessing to himself or others. No amount of knowledge imparted can become a means of grace; and is consequently no power to elevate or unfold a fallen nature. To expect true light and life from mere intellectual communion is as superficial as to look for light and warmth from a moon when no sun shines upon it. As Christ is the light of the world, so Christianity is the sun, of which all the light of science is mere reflection. Only children regard the lights in the calm lake as true suns and stars—those who have put away childish things know that the true lights shine from the pure heaven above, and from earth the reflection.

Equally inadequate is the word *instruction*—which means to build up knowledge in the mind—to deposit its materials there as in stores. By this process a mind may be put in the same case as a man over-loaded with wealth, who is only the more useless to others, and the more miserable to himself, on that account.

The mind is not a dead store-house, divided into departments or granaries, each ready to be filled with its appropriate stores; and education is not merely the building in of these stores of knowledge. The human life is an organism; and the proper design of education is to strengthen that organism, and promote its healthy action. A mere building into this organism may hinder instead of promoting its action. By mere instruction the deep real want of the human spirit is far from being met.

Now whilst in the true idea of Christian education all these conceptions are comprehended—so that there is a drawing out, or *education;* a *training*, as by outward regulation and care; a *teaching*, as by outward presentation and communication to the mind; and *instruction*, as by filling the mind with stores of knowledge—yet, there is also underlying these, and working beneath and in them, that which characterizes true Christian education, and which is truly and beautifully expressed by the word NURTURE, as used by Paul, when he enjoins that children be brought up "in the *nurture* and admonition of the Lord."

Nurture is what the soil, moisture, air, and sunlight are to the plant; what the maternal bosom, and the life and spirit of the family are to the infant what the ordinances, means of grace and communion of the Church, are to the growing Christian. Nurture is that silent, unseen, gradual, but powerful effect produced by the surrounding spiritual atmosphere, in which the pupil lives, breathes, and is healthy—an air embosoming teacher, pupil, books, science, study and recreation—the unseen life and spirit of an Institution. This atmosphere, this spirit and life which nurtures, must be Christianity—underlying, and breathing in all education, training, teaching, and instruction, leavening them all into its own form and spirit, pervading them all with divine vigor, and sanctifying them all to high and holy ends. This is the only leaven that can transform, the only salt that can savor and preserve the high intellectual interests of the world, and sustain and promote true civilization; for "civilization is but Christianity applied to society."

The first and most important office of education is to give the pupil the right *position*—till he attain this, all his development is but entanglement and confusion. He must see the unity and harmony of science. But where is its unity except in Christ? in whom are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. Only He who made the world, is the Revealer of its mysteries. The eternal WORD must be first heard. Where is the harmony of science, but in the spirit of Christianity, which makes all things one, by subordinating all to Christ, who is the true head of all things to the Church, and to whom the smallest wonders of science, the worm, the blade, the rock, even as the cherub nearest the throne—must ascribe all wisdom and glory, forever.

It would be an easy thing to show that the principle of faith enters into all science as its ultimate basis. Philosophy, natural science, astronomy, even the exact science of mathematics—all must at last *assume* their first and deepest principles. With nothing does the teacher find it more necessary to make his pupil better acquainted than with axioms and postulates. This is the hard-pan which lies at last under all our tilling; and the teacher who would proudly spurn the idea that Christian faith must underlie knowledge, must at last quiet the Why? the How? and the What? of his earnest pupil, by the answer "So it is—an axiom, a postulate—self-evident truth—to be believed, not understood. Believe this and you shall understand the rest." How little we know! and what we do know, we know because we have believed something else first. Thus science, when we have followed it to its ultimate principles directs us to faith as its own last ground—points to faith as the highest reason, and to Christianity as the mother and nurse of all true knowledge.

Have we fairly shown, by various modes of argumentation and illustration, that Christianity cannot be sundered from the interests of mental development—then, what God has joined together let not man put asunder.

In calling attention to this subject we have not been beating the air. The popular idea of education at present rests

on the theory that mind alone can be properly treated in the matter of education. The secular element predominates in our schools; and the intellectual development of man, it is professed, will usher in the golden age of national and social advancement. This theory with its manifest tendencies, gives us no such hope, but on the contrary fills us with inexpressible fear! We fear power, any kind of power, even the divine power, when we see not behind it, and in it, grace mercy, and love. Education is power; and we dread it when it is unsanctified by religion, and wielded by spirits unrenewed in grace, and unconsecrated by the spirit of our holy Christianity. The iron horse, with bowels of fire, ribs of steel, and neck of thunder, is a pride and a glory *on the track*—but a ruinous demon *beside it.* Knowledge when it bows to Jesus Christ, and walks in His ways is an angel of light; when it rejects Him, and walks in its own ways, it is a rebel, like any other angel that stands not in its true estate, whose home and doom is the pit.

Dark are the shadows, which still lie and move on the earth, of "clouds without water carried about of winds." Many still are the "trees whose fruit withereth." But history will yet justify herself to her children, and evermore call back the earnest inquirer to principles which in his first essay he has overlooked, and passed by. The human mind, and those who have its development in charge, will yet discover the true steady beacon amid the "raging waves" and the "wandering stars" which toss about and mislead the pilots of human thought. Jesus Christ is still in the schools, "in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions." Teachers will sooner or later yield suitable reverence to the words of the Word, and to the truths of the Truth. They will yet learn to believe that they may know; and approaching the great and solemn problems of science with an ear open to His words, and a heart in sympathy with His Spirit, they will be both delighted and "astonished at His understanding and answers."

Lancaster, Pa. H. H.

ART. V.—THE IDYLS OF THEOCRITUS.

THE pastoral poetry of the ancient Greeks, we confess, is of a humble order. To the high ideal in art it makes no pretentions. It does not often, as does the grander Epos and tragedy, from the far back heroic times of legend and fable, draw its imaginary scenes, but takes them generally from nature as seen abroad in daily life. To almost superhuman beauty or grandeur, fashioned forth from the poet's imagination, it does not seek to give "a local habitation and a name," but rather, like the new comedy, tries to hold the mirror up to nature and "catch the manners living as they rise." Indeed even than comedy it is less artistic and ideal. Not being intended for representation on the stage, it has less plot and fewer incidents. In truth its whole scenes are generally nothing more than a set of simple dialogues between shepherds vying with each other in their musical abilities, having now and then a short narrative thrown in between as explanatory, and sometimes placed before them, as a prologue, some descriptive verses. In this way these pastorals, more than does any other species of poetry to be met with in Grecian literature, come to resemble in some places that kind of modern poetry called the Descriptive. Indeed what Theocritus intended his to be, and what they really are, can be seen from the title which he has placed before them. He has called them *Idyls*, meaning thereby pictures or images. They are graphic descriptions of life and manners, the scenes of which are not always laid among the mountains of his native Sicily, nor are they confined wholly to his own times. Of city life besides he has given us some vivid and amusing representations, as it was to be met with among the middling classes of his day, especially at their great festivals, and once or twice has he thrown his scenes far back into the old heroic times of adventure and glory, thus investing them with an ancient charm which makes us feel while

reading them, in each case, as if we had really fallen all unexpectedly upon some hallowed fragment of a lost epic.

But, though bucolic poetry of any description, as we have just said, belongs not properly to the high ideal in art, yet the pastoral life of ancient Sicily, on account of its charming scenery and classical associations, so far surpassed that of any country in modern times, that in comparison it seems almost of itself to rise into a poetic sphere approaching very nearly the high ideal, at any rate in rural life. Of the fertile soil and varied climate of that island, who has never heard? To say nothing of Hybla, full of bees, and other celebrated mountains in it, who has not been charmed with what travelers tell us about mount Aetna? Around its base and up its sides for some twelve or fifteen miles, they say, are ever blooming the trees of the tropics, the palms and aloes, the grape vines and olive and orange trees. Here are ever heard the buzzing of bees, the cooing of doves and the serenades of nightingales. Ascending from these, the adventurer comes into a more temperate clime, and feels cooler breezes, as upwards, for some seven or eight miles further, he wends his way beneath venerable oaks, and chesnuts, and beeches, and lastly under the firs and pines. Here often is the squirrel seen peeping out from the branches above, and the rabbit and partridge scudding away beneath. In both these regions, the tropical and temperate, are extended the richest pastures and most magnificent park-like scenery. Above these to its bleak summit, a thousand feet, rises sublimely the snowy region.

Beside the fine natural scenery, however, showing itself every where throughout the whole island, in olden times were also many consecrated spots, scenes of stories and legends told by the ancient poets, which could still be pointed out, and with which the Sicilian shepherds were as familiar as with household words. Out from Aetna in the sea, were still conspicuously to be seen the famous rocks which Polyphemus had hurled after the retreating ships

of Ulysses. Near Syracuse was still gushing up the renowned fountain augmented by the enamored flood of

> "Divine Alpheus, who by secret sluice,
> Stole under seas to meet his Arethuse;"

and in the vale of Enna, were still blooming the distinguished meads beside the yellow fields beloved and frequented by Demeter, where her daughter Persephone,

> "gathering flowers,
> Herself, a fairer flower, by gloomy Dis,
> Was gathered."

Then had the shepherds legends of their own, not as yet to be met with in any of the books. They knew, for instance, all about the unfortunate love affair of Polyphemus and the coquettish treatment he had received from Galatea, the fairest of the naiads; they had often heard repeated the melancholy complaints of the coy herdsman Menalaus, and they were familiar too with all the touching circumstances connected with the deplorable death of Daphnis, that prince of herdsmen. We make no mention of the destructive monsters said to have been always watching for ships outside of their island, the barking Scylla and fell Charybdis, the treacherous sirens with their seductive voices, and moreover beneath the island itself pressed down by the weight of Aetna, that awfully great, extended giant, Typhoeus with his hundred heads. These mythical beings entered not much into the mythology of the shepherds, and whenever thought of by them they caused them no great uneasiness, but, like the lashing billows along their coast, or the deceitful calm of the ocean abroad, or the sleeping terrors of Aetna underneath, they only threw around their comfortable island a terrific grandeur and imparted to their quiet homes an additional charm by way of happy contrast.

Dwelling amid such scenery with the spirit of antiquity thus looking out of it and giving to it, as does the soul to a beautiful countenance, new life and expression, how could the shepherds keep sometimes from feeling a little poetical? Watching their flocks and herds on those romantic

slopes, beneath the elms and oaks, in their idle hours how could they keep occasionally from weaving some of these legends into verse? and when they began to improve in vocal and instrumental music, how could they keep from becoming a little ambitious and vying with one another in song? No wonder too that in time some of them arrived at such proficiency and gained such skill in the art of singing and playing that, giving up the tending of herds and flocks, they made music their profession.

The way these shepherds first became connected with the worship of Artemis is variously accounted for. As pastorals in their style and composition are somewhat dramatic, one might suppose that their reciters or singers, would more likely have devoted themselves to the service of Dionysus, the great protector of players. With the wild orgies of this god, however, they had no sympathy. They preferred a milder worship. During the Persian invasion, according to one account, when the annual feast of Artemis came round at Sparta, all the virgin singers and dancers had hid themselves from fear of the enemy; whereupon some shepherds, coming into the temple, supplied their places in the celebration by singing some of their native songs. This new entertainment fell in so well with the entire spirit of her festival that it was ever afterwards retained. Some, however, place the introduction of these songs into her worship much earlier. They say that when Orestes carried off from Tauris the image of Artemis and brought it into Italy, that, to expiate his crime, he was required by the oracle to lave himself seven times in as many streams, all issuing from a single fountain. At Rhegium, having found the proper rivulets, he bathed as required, after which he passed over into Tyndaris in Sicily, where the shepherds, gathering around the sacred image, celebrated the goddess with their choicest songs. With this appropriate reception was she so well pleased that ever afterwards she became their protecting deity and always had some of them to take a part in her festivals.

At Tyndaris and Syracuse, whenever her feasts came

round, some shepherds or herdsmen, either two of them or two parties of them, enlivened the ceremonies by their musical contests with one another, and these, making this their vocation, came to constitute at last a class of performers well known throughout the whole country under the names of the Lydiastae and Bucolistae. On their way to these cities to join in the festivals, somewhat odd and ludicrous, we confess, must have been the appearances they presented, more resembling those of satyrs or clowns than of good and honest shepherds or herdsmen. Their crooks were all right enough and also their leathern scrips with pulse in them, which they carried, but besides these they wore crowns and branching antlers, and slung around their shoulders somehow, they had each a wheaten loaf imprinted with figures of animals and a goatskin filled with wine. The vanquished gave up all these to the victors who remained in the cities. As for themselves, deprived thus of their wine and bread and pulse, they strolled abroad afterwards through the neighboring towns and rural districts, recruiting themselves and receiving from the people before whom they sang and played, rewards and sustenence, like wandering minstrels. To conciliate favor, whomever they approached they saluted with a benediction not wholly unlike the *Pax vobiscum* of Christian monks :

> Receive from us good fortune and good health receive,
> Which bear we from the goddess, which she bade us give.

The most then that Theocritus had to do was, from the mouths of these strolling singers and from those of the shepherds of the country, to gather up these floating legends, these unwritten songs, and throw them into more respectable shapes. In performing this task, however, so well suited to his genius, he took great liberties with his collections and improved them very much. Dispensing with their rude Priapéan measures he raised them into more dignified hexameters, modified, it is true, somewhat, and brought down from their heroic stateliness a little to suit his humbler themes. Retaining of these legends their simplicity of sentiment and broad Doric dialect, he yet wove

them so happily into his epic verse and diction as to elevate their whole tone and character and make them assume, as forming a new and distinct species of verse, a very high position in classical literature.

Of pastoral poetry the heroes, as we have said, belonged not always to the present times, but some of them had lived in the remotest ages. On this account the poet could throw around them all the halo of the past and place them almost on a par in this respect with the renowned warriors of the ancient Epos and tragedy. Daphnis, for instance, had flourished in those mythical times, beyond the ken of history, when there were lions in Sicily ; and bears and wolves, and lynxes were far more common than they were in later days and better behaved. He was the beau ideal of a faithful herdsman, and to bring out his worth in full, of course, his constancy had to be tested. With him, in early life, a naiad fell in love and made him promise that he would never form a connexion with any other maiden, adding the threat that he would become blind if he ever violated his vow. Possessed of superior beauty and having besides great skill in music, being, in fact, the inventor of bucolic poetry, his society was much sought after, especially by young ladies, and few of them could look on him wholly unconcerned. Even Aphrodite or Cypris, queen of beauty, who always had, as we all know, a great *penchant* towards herdsmen and shepherds, was moved by his simple but winning address and fine accomplishments, and would have given him her love, but when the faithful swain treated her advances with coldness, her favor was turned into displeasure, and to cause his fall she incited against him also her son, that inconsiderate, winged boy who shoots at us so much at random, his tormenting arrows. Still Daphnis, setting at naught the frivolous bolt of Eros, would have come off unscathed in the end, had he not been overtaken by a stratagem. By a certain princess, whom, no doubt, Cypris had thrown into his way, he was made intoxicated, and while under the influence of wine he entirely forgot his vow, and, of course, was immediately

struck stone blind. Fleeing into the deepest shades he tried at first to console himself with music, but no longer visited now by his naiad, whom he still passionately loved, he gradually pined away and at last died. Before this sad conclusion of his woes he was visited by many gods and herdsmen and shepherds, some consoling and others bantering him. He heard them all, however, in silence, nursing alone his secret sorrow, until at length Cypris, the cause of all his griefs, arrived and was exulting over him. Then he could remain silent no longer, but, like a dying swan, uttered his last song. This was the song that the shepherd Thyrsis knew, and which, in the first Idyl of Theocritus, the Goatherd is very desirous to hear him repeat. To induce him to sing it he tells him he will give him in return for his song one of his best milch goats, whose good domestic properties he sets forth, and besides an ivy cup on whose wonderful carvings outside he descants at large. A sight of them, however, to keep up his curiosity, he witholds till afterwards.

THYRSIS AND THE GOATHERD.

THYRSIS.

Sweet, in a measure, goatherd, are the whisperings of that pine tree,
Which near the fountain blows, and sweetly breathe do you likewise
The shepherd's pipe. You, after Pan, the second prize would bear off.
The horned goat should he receive, the female goat would you take ;
But his meed should the female be, to you would fall as guerdon
The kid, and of the kid sweet is the flesh till you have milked her.

GOATHERD.

Sweeter, O shepherd, is your singing than the mellow dashing
Which down from that high rock the water falling fast is making.
The ewe prefer, in case the muses should, to be their present,
Then would you take the weaned lamb, but should they rather
Receive the lamb, to you, of right, would fall the ewe thereafter.

THYRSIS.

Please, by the nymphs, O goatherd, will you in this place down seated,
Where gently slopes the hill and round the tamarisks are blooming,
To play for me your pipe? and I your goats meanwhile will look to.

GOATHERD.

Unlawful is it, shepherd, at full noon, for us unlawful
To play the pipe. We are afraid of Pan ; for then from hunting

He wearied seeks repose, and, if disturbed the while, is peevish,
And ever round his dispread nose is waspish anger settled.
But come, Thyrsis,, for you surely know well the Griefs of Daphnis,
And you the highest art have reached to form bucolic verses,
This way ; beneath that elm let us be seated, to Priapus
And the spring nymphs right opposite, where standing is that rustic
Seat for such use, and oaks are round it. There, in case you sing me
Such strains as with the Lybian Cromus once you sang contending,
I will give you a goat, twin-bearing, twice that comes to milking,
Which, though she has two kids, will yield besides of milk two pailfuls,
And a deep cup of ivy wood inlaid with fragrant beeswax,
Two handled, newly formed, still smelling from the carver's chisel.
Of which the brim surrounding twines aloft the graceful ivy ;
Ivy all set between with marigolds, and it, among these,
Twisting its young twigs, hangs along profuse its yellow berries.
These underneath, a woman, workmanship of gods, is sculptured,
In flowing robes and fillet finely shewn ; and men beside her,
As exquisites, wearing long hair, in turn one with another
Contend in gibes ; but this her heart, oh cruel ! never touches.
One while to that man throws she smilingly soft glances,
Another while to this she's all attention. They still hanging
On her with eyes from passion swollen, uselessly are troubled.
Besides these an old fisherman, out in the sea, is sculptured,
Upon a rock, from which he through the waves drags quick his great net.
Old is he, but he toils as hard as were he in full vigor.
Of him in sooth it might be said, with all his might he fishes ;
So round his neck and shoulders every where the veins are swollen.
Old is he, to be sure, but for the nonce his strength is youthful.
Removed a little way from this gray-beard, sea-worn and wasted,
A vineyard is, with grapes all ready, ripened, heavy laden ;
Of which a certain little boy keeps watch, beside the thorn-hedge
Seated ; and by him are two foxes, one of which is walking
Between the rows and pulling down the dainty grapes, the other,
Slyly to take his wallet set, says to herself: This Argus
I will not leave, till in the lurch I leave him——with no dinner !
But he for locusts a nice cage of asphodels is weaving,
Binding them down with rushes ; and he thinks not of his wallet
Nor of the vines so much as he is pleased with his own platting.
All round this cup below is carved the flexible acanthus.
A rare Aeolean work of art, when seen 'twill raise your wonder.
For it in honest trade gave I a Calydonian sailor
A milch goat and a monstrous cheese, the best of my own pressing.
Upon it I have not yet placed my lips, but it is laid up
Still undefiled. With right good will on you will I bestow it,
If you for me will friendly sing that song of yours I long for ;
And grudge you will I not. Come on, dear sir ; no use your verses
Unsung to keep for Hades' realm, where all things are forgotten.

THYRSIS.

Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Thyrsis this is of Aetna and this is the voice of Thyrsis.
Where were ye, O ye nymphs, when Daphnis wasted lorn, where were ye?
Or on Peneus' banks in Tempe's vale, or on high Pindus?
For held ye not the while near him the rapid stream, Anapus,
Nor Aetna's summits of broad view nor Acis' sacred water.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Wanting his song the lynxes mourned, his dirge the wolves were howling,
And roared the lion, in deep shades, distraught that he had perished.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Round him were gathered many kine and many saddened bullocks
And calves and heifers many, sore oppressed, for him lorn lowing.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Came Hermes from the mountain first and said: Now tell me, Daphnis,
Who wears you thus away? Of whom are you so much enamored?
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Came next his fellow herdsmen, shepherds came, and lastly goatherds,
All anxiously inquiring what was ailing. Came Priapus
And said: Wretched Daphnis, what makes you pine away? That maiden,
By every fount, through every grove, on eager feet is hurried—
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses—
Seeking; but you, wayward in love, are heedlessly inconstant.

* * * * * * * *

Them nothing answered did the herdsman, but endured, of his own
Love the bitter pain, aye e'en to life's dark close endured it.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Came Cypris to him also, pleased the while, why not? and smiling;—
Bitterly smiling, but at heart she had a heavy sorrow,—
And said: Daphnis, you boasted once that Eros you could conquer,
But now it seems you are yourself by Eros sadly conquered.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Thus taunted answered her the dying Daphnis: Cruel Cypris,
Cypris to be dreaded, Cypris to mortals ever fatal!
Thus, as you see, for us in sooth is now the last sun setting,
But Daphnis, even in the Shades, shall be Love's biding trouble.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Steal, where they say with Cypris that a herdsman——Steal to Ida;
Steal to your dear Anchises. There the oaks and there the rushes
And there the lulling bees around their combs will suit you.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Suit you too will Adonis, seeing sheep he also pastures
And at the rabbits throws his crook and such like small game follows.
Better brave Diomede again, this time more near advancing,
And say: The herdsman Daphnis have I conquered, now come fight me
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
Ye wolves, ye lynxes and ye bears in mountain dens that slumber,

Farewell! Your herdsman I, Daphnis, no more will roam the wild woods,
No more the dusky groves nor thickets. Farewell, Arethusa,
And streams that roll your chrystal waters down into the Thymbris.
Begin, ye muses bland, begin the plain bucolic verses.
O Pan, Pan, whether on the mountain ranges of Lycaeus
You stay, or guard great Maenalus, come to this island.
Ev'n if beyond, from Rhion come, over your favorite mountain,
Called for Lycaon's son, unstayed, though to the gods delightsome.
Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Come, O thou king and take from me this honey-breathing panspipe,
Of reeds compact with wax together, to the lip well rounded;
Since really now by Love am I to Hades straightway borne off.
Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Now violets let brambles bear and bear them the acanthus,
The juniper bush deck itself with flowers of the narcissus;
All interchanged let nature be, the pines with pears be laden,
Since Daphnis dies; the deer in chase, the hounds, hard after seize on,
And in the mountains nightingales with owls together warble.
Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Thus having said he ceased, and to restore him Aphrodita
Ardently wished; but by the Fates his threads had all been spun out,
And Daphnis went down to the dark river whose surges bore off
The man to all the muses dear and by the nymphs not hated.
Give o'er, ye muses, go, give o'er the plain bucolic verses.
Now fetch me forth that goat and cup that I may, having milked her,
Make libation to the muses. Oh, farewell, often, muses,
Farewell; but I with you sweetlier will sing also hereafter.

GOATHERD.

With honey filled be that enchanting mouth of yours, O Thyrsis,
And with the honey-comb; with figs from Aegilus be feasted,
The very best, since you than any tettix sing far better.
Here, take this treasured cup. Look at it, friend; how fresh its odor!
Dipped would you think it had been in the fountains of the Horae.
Come hither, Nannie. Take her and milk her. Ye graceless young goats,
Give o'er your friskings or old Beardy there will come and——butt you!

Even in the Odyssey, terrible as Polyphemus is represented to be, we are made to smile nevertheless at his credulity and artlessness. With all his simplicity of manners, however, we are utterly shocked at his want of humanity. His very tender mercies are cruel. For the good wine with which he had been treated by Ulysses he can think of making him no higher return than the promise that he will not eat him up immediately, but reserve him for his last meal, after he has used up all his compan-

ions as relishes at his suppers. For such a cold blooded monster we can be made to feel no sympathy even in his sufferings, and we rejoice at last when his eye has been thrust out with a stake, as his prisoners are thus enabled to escape. The Sicilian shepherds, however, regarded him with kindlier feelings. Though he was the son of Poseidon and a sea nymph, yet somehow he belonged also to the stock of the Cyclopes, the most ancient people of the island. They therefore, respected him as being not merely a native but an aboriginal. Laying hold, in his character, of all that was redeeming, they made the best use of it they could. They went back in their tales to his earlier days, when he was yet a shepherd boy in the mountains, of colossal proportions, it is true, but of a gentle nature, ere he had met with his heavy disappointments in life, which turned him into a recluse and an anthropophagite. Possessed he was of a voice, deep and rich, at any rate when heard in the distance, and he could play charmingly on the panspipe. Therefore, let Homer say what he will, and whatever he became afterwards, when a young Cyclops, he was certainly susceptible of the most tender impressions. His first and only love was Galatea, the fairest of the naiads. He met her for the first time when, a little girl, she came up out of the ocean with his mother to gather hyacinths on the mountain side. From that time forward he could never forget her, but, of course, his affection was unrequited. This disproportioned love affair was the theme of many a jocose and many a sentimental song among the shepherds. Down till the time of Theocritus and long afterwards he was their standing butt and great pet monster, who, they half believed, might possibly still be staying somewhere in the woody region of mount Aetna. In the charming summer nights of Sicily, when all the world there was then out of doors, as it is at such times even now, the merry girls abroad in bands together were in the habit of calling far up to him on the mountain, and if, in return, a rustling sound came sweeping down to them through the leaves, they startled half alarmed, and,

looking at one another, giggled outright as if they had really heard him coming. On a bright summer's day too, near the shore, one lad would sometimes seat himself upon a rock, trying to imitate Polyphemus, by looking big, playing on his panspipe and seeming to be as wholly absorbed as he possibly could in his music, while another would try to rouse him up by calling on him to observe the freaks of Galatea whom he let on he saw sporting in the water.

DAMOETAS AND DAPHNIS.

Damoetas and the herdsman, Daphnis, once into the same place
Their herds together drove, Aratus; one of them was downy
Chinned, the other tender-bearded. There seated by a fountain,
At mid-day, in the summer time, together thus they chanted.
And first began Daphnis, because he first had thrown the challenge.

DAPHNIS.

See, Polyphemus, how she pelts your flock, that Galatea,
With apples, calling you a goatherd and in love a laggard!
Whilst you, O dolt! O dolt! sit careless all absorbed in piping,
Never once looking at her. There, your faithful bitch that follows
After your sheep she hit, and off she starts a barking,
And looks into the deep; but her the waters scarcely ruffled,
Shew but herself as on the verge with ears up prickt she prances.
Take care! the ugly cur! she'll surely sieze the maiden's ankle,
Should she step out upon the beach, and deeply wound her fair skin.
What winning gestures she assumes to lure you! As of thistles
The airy down, parched into lightness, borne abroad in genial summer,
Will flee if you pursue, but, turn away, it fondly follows.
No trick she leaves untried. Ah, let me tell you, Polyphemus,
Love's eyes are false, and things not fair to her may seem the fairest.

Damoetas then, as Cyclops, thus with deepened voice slow answered.

DAMOETAS.

I knew it all the while, by Pan, that she my sheep was pelting.
She could not scape me; by this sweet, lone eye of mine, she could not,
With which I still do see, though Telemus, that evil prophet,
Foretold its loss. The loss redound on him and on his children!
I knew it, but to vex her, all the while I took no notice;
To make her think I had another sweetheart, which she thinking
Grows jealous of me, O Paeon! and pines and in the ocean
Flings herself thus and peers amid my sheep and round my cavern.
My dog! I winked to her to bark at her, for when I fondle
With her she whines, and on my lap her snout she fondly places;
Which favor shewn her she envying at length o'ercome will send me

A herald; but on him slammed be my door till she forth coming
Swears that herself will make my bridal couch upon this island.
As folks all say, I really bear a very fine appearance,
This struck me once, gazing into the sea when in a calm state.
Fine looking cheeks decidedly I saw, my eye fine looking,
If I know anything of beauty, and the milky whiteness,
Methought, of my teeth fairer shone than that of Parian marble.
To keep these fresh from envy thrice I spat into my bosom.
This charm, to use a crone, a priestless of Cotytto taught me,
For harversters who played the flute, along the Hippoco-on.
Such answer having feigned Damoetas kissed his fellow Daphnis,
Who gave a flute to him, who gave in turn to him a panspipe.
Damoetas wakes his flute and with him pipes the herdsman Daphnis,
And thereupon along the meads the calves all set to dancing.
Neither of them the other conquered. Both remained unrivalled.

Such singing as this, however, is nothing better than boy's play. Addressing himself to his friend and fellow poet, the physician Nicias, Theocritus rises into a higher sphere. He shews us Polyphemus in a more interesting attitude uttering sentiments of the purest affection in such an unsophisticated strain that we become touched at once with his artlessness and simplicity. Fully aware now of his own want of personal charms he yet fancies that his mistress may possibly be pleased with him on account of his large possessions, his well supplied dairy and great number of sheep.

THE CYCLOPS.

A balm to heal the wound of love is nowhere to be met with
In art or nature, Nicias, in simples or in compounds,
But in the muses. Theirs the power that's gentle and subduing
And to be had by men, but few, the gifted, that attain it.
Which fact full well you know, I think, for being a physician,
You by the sacred Nine besides are dearly loved and favored.
Thus eas'liest, at any rate, came off our native Cyclops,
The olden Polyphemus, when inflamed of Galatea;
What time his beard began to sprout about his mouth and temples.
He wooed her, not with roses, not with apples, not with ringlets,
But with wild plaints, and fixed on her, all other things neglected.
His silly sheep back to their folds oft trooped themselves untended
From their green pastures, whilst himself, singing of Galatea,
Still kept the weedy sea-shore, where lone wandering he had wasted
From morning red, beneath his breast pained by the sad infliction
From mighty Cypris, in his heart deep planted, like an arrow.
But still he found the sovreign balm, while, seated on a high rock,
With longing looks all seaward cast, he sang away in this wise:

O my white Galatea, why your lover have you cast off?
Whiter than cream-cheese to behold, more gentle than a lamb-kin,
Than calf more frisky, smoother than of unripe grapes the clusters!
As such you ever come to me what times sweet slumbers hold me;
As such you ever fleet away what times sweet slumbers leave me.
You flee me as a sheep that sees the grayish wolf approaching.
I was enamored of you, maiden, even from the first time
You came up to the mountain-side along with my own mother,
To gather hyacinths; the way to show I went before you.
From gazing on you then and ever after till this present
I could not keep; but you care nothing for me, no, just nothing.
I know the reason, charming maiden, why you always shun me.
You do not like my shaggy eyebrow over all my forehead
Reaching from ear to ear across, a single but a long one,
And my lone eye beneath, and, o'er my lip, my nose that's flatted.
Such as I am, however, still of sheep I own a thousand;
From which the foaming milk I press and drink of it the choicest.
Fresh cheeses never fail me, not in summer, not in fruit time,
Not e'en in latest winter. Overburthened are my baskets.
And I can breathe the pipe and sing as knows not any Cyclops;
Singing of you, my own sweet apple, and myself together
All through the stormy nights. I'm keeping for you fawns eleven
All wearing splendid collars, and four tender bear cubs.
But come out once to us, just come, and you will be no loser.
Let the dark billows lift you up and bear you to the sea-shore.
When in our cave you'll find it sweeter there to spend the evenings.
There ever blooms the laurel, there the slender branching cypress;
There the dark ivy climbs and there the vine of sweetest clusters;
Whose juice to pale cold water drips, with which the woody Aetna,
From her pure snows that gleam above, ambrosial drink, supplies me.
Instead of such things who would choose to hold the sea or billows?
But if to you I seem myself to be too rough and hairy,
Oak splinters are at hand and living coals beneath the ashes
With which to singe me. Ev'n my soul to you I would surrender
And my lone eye to burn, than which not any thing is dearer.
Ah me! my mother did not bear me having gills of fishes,
Else would I dive me down and kiss, at any rate, your fingers,
If mouth you would not wish. Along I'd take you or white lilies
Or tender poppy heads having the red explosive petals.
But these, the first in summer bloom, the others in late winter.
So both of them to you at once I could not take together.
Forthwith now, maiden, will I now be taught to be a swimmer
By some kind sailor in a ship that hither comes a sailing;
And I will taste your life if sweet far down within the sea-depths.
Will you come up, my Galatea, and when up, oh never!
As do not I while seated here, think more of going homeward!
But keep with us the flocks together and express the rich milk;
And make the curds for cheeses come by putting in the runnet.

My mother wrongs me, she alone, and her the most I censure;
For never drops she any word to you that's kind and tender
Concerning me, though every day she sees me growing thinner.
I'll tell her, yes, I'll tell her of my head and feet sore throbbing,
That she for my sake too may grieve as I am deeply grieving.
O Cyclops, Cyclops, whither thus are wandering thy poor senses!
Go, plat your baskets in your cave and, cutting off the young shoots,
Supply your lambs. Thus will you soon at heart be feeling better.
The present sheep prefer to milk, the one that flees why follow?
Perhaps you'll find another Galatea and a lovelier;
For many merry girls at night to come and sport call to me,
Far down the glens, and giggle all whene'er they know I'm listening.
On land, at any rate, ev'n I seem to be counted some one.
Thus Polyphemus soothed his love by chanting his wild verses.
And came off better in the end than had he—paid the doctor.

In publishing thus a few of these idyls we have been actuated partly by the same motive which induced Theocritus to write them at first. We wish to make our readers, whether for their pleasure or profit, a little better acquainted, as he does his, with the life and manners of the old Sicilian shepherds. We wish moreover to draw, to the finely executed pictures themselves of this rare old artist, the attention of amateurs and scholars, as of late years, we think, they have been altogether too much thrust aside and neglected. Though exceedingly simple in their style and composition these poems are yet master-pieces of art in their kind, being truer delineations of nature than any pastorals that have ever since been written. Like the best paintings in oils of later years, they have been nothing injured by the lapse of time, but rather mellowed and improved. What we have given above, of course, are not any of the pictures themselves. They are merely some copies or transcripts from the original; and though we have tried, in rendering them into English, to be as literal as possible, giving them, for the most part, word for word and certainly always line for line, yet a great deal of their spirit, we feel conscious, has escaped in the transfer. They cannot be brought over fully into another language. To catch all their simple pathos and quaint humor and rich expression they must be read only in their broad Doric.

W. M. N.

Art. VI.—THE EUTYCHIAN CHURCHES.*

The apostles of Christ, in obedience to the command of their Master, preached to all the world repentance toward God and faith in Jesus Christ, and those, that believed their word, were received into the Christian Church by baptism. This faith was an authoritative faith (*Πιστις*), i. e., the preached word was received by the hearers on the authority of the apostles, no matter whether their whole deportment made them appear as credible, unexceptionable witnesses, or, these favorable impressions were produced by signs and wonders, wrought by them. But this faith did not necessarily include the whole scheme of Christian salvation; where it did, it was only in embryo, and required time for development. The Christian mind rests but for a time satisfied with an authoritative faith, and then longs to understand, digest and develop into full consciousness the object of faith—the principium essendi,—the authoritative faith embodying the first germs of *γνωσις* (knowledge). This anthropological view we find fully sustained and corroborated by the history of the Church. It was but for a short time that the Church was satisfied with a belief in Christ as the Messiah; His relation both to God and man was soon made the subject of earnest investigation; and by blending with exclusively Christian elements ethnical and Jewish ideas, a *γνωσις*, sometimes friendly, oftener hostile to Christianity, but in every instance truth mixed with error, was the result. Of this kind were the Ebionites, who saw in Christ a mere man, however highly gifted in other respects; Jesus was to them, what Mohammed is to his followers. At his baptism a higher aeon descended upon him, taught and wrought miracles through him, but left the man Jesus on the cross. Cerinthus, who headed this party of Ebionites,

* Compiled mainly from the German of Hoffman.

formed the transition to the real Gnostics, who, for the most part, inverted the case and denied the humanity of Christ; this system culminated in Manicheism. The so-called Catholic Church developed her faith, formally at least, in the same manner. After different views of Christ had been broached and rejected, Arius arose, who made Christ a creature. His numerous disciples did not dream, by following him, of departing from their former faith. Still larger was the party of the Semiarians; and without the overwhelming superiority of Athanasius, it is but too probable, humanly speaking, that Semiarianism would have triumphed at Nice. Truth, however, prevailed; partly by its intrinsic force, partly by means that we deplore, it became the universally received opinion of the Church.

Christ's divinity having been authoritatively settled, the relation of His two natures claimed the attention of the Church. Here Nestorius acquired an unenviable reputation by teaching that each nature became a personality, so that he had, instead of one, two Christs or Saviours, and if two, of course none at all. For if the two natures in Christ are not so united, that Christ's personality, or I, includes them both and fully—*ατρεπτως*, *ασυγχυτως* and *αδιαιρετως*—as the Synod of Chalcedon has decreed—then God and man are not really united, the deep desire of the human heart is not yet satisfied, and we are not yet saved. Nestorianism was accordingly rejected by the Church, but many opponents of Nestorius, not *by pushing their opposition to him too far, as is generally believed, but by starting from the same fundamental error* and developing it in a different shape, arrived at an opposite but equally fundamental error. They assumed, as Nestorius did, two concretes in Christ, a divine Christ and a human Christ, but in order to bring about a unio personalis, they curtailed both His divine and His human nature, making Him more than a man, but less than God, a kind of demi-God. This is Eutychianism. Both these views are rejected by the Church as heretical; but there are good reasons for believing, that these errors

are still in vogue, that Nestorianism is really the faith of the many, as appears from the facility with which they expound certain texts of Scripture by saying, that such a clause or such an act belongs to Christ as God, and such a one to Him as a man; but it appears still more from the fact, that Eutychianism and Nestorianism are regarded as opposite extremes, whereas they involve the same fundamental error, in consequence of which controversialists charge each other with these heresies, as if it were a matter of course, that the truth must lie between the two extremes. In order to prove this statement, we shall advert to but one fact: the passage, John 8: 58, is explained by all the English commentators with whom I am acquainted, if any notice is taken of it at all, as if Christ had said: before Abraham was, *I was*, and a French translation, which I have at hand, actually translates it so: j' etais. From these desultory remark, it is also evident how far those miss the mark, who maintain that a study of christology, or soteriology is of no account; that men ought to become converted and that correct views of these subjects would follow as a matter of course!! Yet our object is not to write a metaphysical essay on the God-man, but to give a condensed history of the Eutychian Churches, and as these Churches have, in consequence of their separation from the orthodox Church, undergone but slight changes, a description of them is, at the same time, a description of the whole Church in the fifth century. The Eutychian Churches are: the *Egyptian or Coptic*, the *Arminian*, the *Ethiopian*, and the *Abyssinian*.

THE EGYPTIAN CHURCH.

It is not exactly known by whom Christianity was planted in Egypt. According to Acts 2: 10; 6: 9; 18: 24, it would seem that seeds of the Christian religion were sowed there in the very earliest times. Eusebius of Caesarea, (History 2, 16) says, that Mark, the fellow-traveller of Peter, went to Egypt after Peter's death, and became the first bishop of Alexandria. Here arose the great catechists, Pantaenus, Clemens, Origines and Heracles; and the still greater

Athanasius was also an Egyptian. When the doctrine of Eutyches was condemned and persecuted as heresy, the great body of the people espoused Monophysitism (but another name for Eutychianism) (2,000,000), while only a small minority of 200,000 held the faith of the orthodox Church. They called themselves also the Coptic Church, not from the town *Κοπτος*, as has been erroneously supposed, but from *Αιγυπτος-Γυπτος*, and called the orthodox party Melchites—from meloch, king, likewise, the emperor's Christians. The two parties had after this time two patriarchs. They hated each other with a rather unchristian hatred, and murdered each other on every occasion; yea the Copts assisted the Mohammedans greatly in subjugating their own country. At first they were mildly treated and had to pay but a moderate tribute; but ere long they were sorely persecuted, and although Egypt has changed its rulers a number of times, yet the Christians have always suffered, and it may justly be said, that they have atoned by their sufferings during 1200 years for their sins. At present their number is but 200,000, 60,000 of whom live in Cairo, the rest in Upper Egypt in villages, partly alone, partly together with the Arabian Fellahs (peasants). The patriarch of Alexandria, who, however, resides in Cario, has been at their head from the times of the Arabs. His jurisdiction extends beyond Egypt as far as Nubia and Abyssinia, from which country he elects and consecrates the patriarch (Abuna). He himself is chosen from the monks, the bishops and arch priests applying, when the seat is vacant, to the abbot of St. Anthony's convent who proposes six or eight monks, and from this number the patriarch is selected by lot. A detachment of soldiers is ordered to conduct him to his new residence, since it has become customary to feign resistance and yield only to force. Next to him in dignity is the patriarch of Jerusalem, who resides likewise at Cario, and visits the holy land but once a year, about Easter, and is the official vicar of the patriarch of Egypt. Under him are twelve real or titular bishops, and under these again the arch priests

and priests, whose duty it is to say mass, but not to preach; *as preaching is something altogether unknown in the Coptic Church.* Then follow the archdeacons, deacons and subdeacons, lectors, cantors and exorcists. The ordination is performed by the patriarch and his bishops with the sacred oil, which, by a miracle of St. Mark, never fails. An apostolical succession, *by the imposition of hands*, is entirely unknown.

The priests belong to the lower ranks of society and are ignorant, rude and poor; they live by agriculture and on their perquisites from weddings, burials and baptizing, and by begging. The monks read the liturgy. As to their creed, they recognize the three oecumenical synods of Nice, Constantinople and Ephesus, and three liturgies, viz: that of St. Basil, Gregory and Cyril, and the Apostolical Constitutions. The liturgy is read in Coptic, although the common people do not understand the Coptic language. They have seven sacraments, like the Church of Rome; but extreme unction is also applied to healthy persons after great offenses.

The deplorable state of the Coptic Church induced (1825) the Church Missionary Society to permit two missionaries, Sieder and Cruse, to locate at Cairo in order to revive Christianity. They succeeded, after hard labor, in bringing the Bible to the knowledge of the priests, in instructing a few hundred Coptic children in the principles of Christianity, and in establishing a Seminary for priests, from which the present Abuna of the Abyssinian Church has been taken. The patriarch favors their labors. It is true, no evangelical reformation has taken place yet, but the way is fully prepared. If the priests, who are at the same time the lower officers in the villages, should become active and zealous Christians, their influence on the fellahs would be immense.

The Bible is translated into three dialects, viz: the Coptic or Memphitic, the Sahidic or Upper Egyptian and the Basmur—translations which were made in the fourth or fifth centuries.

THE ETHIOPIAN CHURCH.

What used to be called the Ethiopian Church, has undergone so great changes, that it will hardly do to describe it by itself. What we shall say on this subject will apply to the ancient Ethiopian Church, whilst the description of the present Ethipoian Church will be given in connection with the Abyssinian Church. In Acts 8: 27, a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, is mentioned, who became converted under the preaching of Philip; it is likely, indeed, that this high officer preached to his countrymen Christ crucified after his return, *but there are no satisfactory proofs, that a Church was founded by him.* For the ancient Church knew of no Christian Church in Ethiopia proper, and Jerome (catal. script. eccl.) is of opinion, that Arabia Felix was the home of said eunuch. There is indeed a tradition, that makes not less than three of the apostles, Thomas, Andrew, and Matthew, apostles of Ethiopia, but this tradition itself understands different Asiatic countries, even India, by the term Ethiopia, and sound criticism has shorn the whole story of all credibility. The first *reliable* account is, that under Constantine the Great (about 330 B. C.) the heathen philosopher, Metrodōrus, returned from extensive exploring tours in safety to Tyre, and prevailed on Meropius, whom some called a philosopher, others a merchant, to engage in a similar enterprize (see Rufini hist. eccl. I, 5, 9; Theod. hist. eccl. I, 22; Socrates hist. eccl. I, 19; Sozomeni hist. eccl. II, 24). He set out in company with his nephews, Frumentius and Aedesius, and suffered shipwreck on the coasts of Ethiopia—called by the ancients India;—the crew was murdered by the barbarous inhabitants, but the young men were spared and sold as slaves to the king of Axume (now Axum in Tigré); the one became the king's treasurer, the other his butler. The king granted them their liberty before his death. The queen, who reigned in the place of her son Aizan, continued the two Christians in their high offices; and they in turn used their great influence in introducing Christianity into the country. They attracted

Egyptian merchants, and the Christians obtained the right to settle, with many other privileges. Under Aizan Aedesius returned to Tyre; Frumentius went to Alexandria, where Athanasius was patriarch, applied to him for priests for his new home, got them, was himself ordained as bishop, and was now called Abba Salama. The king and his brother were baptized, and Christianity spread rapidly. But the Arian convulsions reached as far as the Alps of Central Africa. The Arians endeavored, but did not succeed, in introducing their tenets into Ethiopia.

Another account of the introduction of the Christian religion into Ethiopia, as given by Cachenus, Nicephorus and Procopius, has been rejected by Ludolf. After Frumentius, the patriarch, or Abuna of Abyssinia, the most important branch of the Ethiopian Church, was consecrated by the patriarch of Alexandria; he had the rank but not the power of a patriarch, and could at no time have more than seven bishops under his jurisdiction. The Bible is indeed translated into Ethiopic, but the laity do not read it at all, and the priests, who read it, do not understand it. Of equal authority with the Bible are the Apostolical Constitutions and Canons in eight parts, for which reason the New Testament is sometimes said to contain thirty-five books. Then follow (in degree of authority) the decrees of the Synods of Nice, Constantinople and Ephesus; to the twenty genuine Canons of the Council of Nice eigty-four spurious ones are added, and these and extracts from the homilies of Athanasius, Basilius, the two Gregories, Chrysostom and Cyrillus, together with some martyrologies and hymns, constitute the literature of the Ethiopian Church.

When the Synod of Chalcedon condemned the patriarch Dioscor of Alexandria as an Eutychian, which gave rise to the sect of the Monophysites, the Ethiopian Church followed her patriarch, calling the orthodox the Melchites, while they in turn, were called Jacobites, from the Syrian Jacob Baradai. But they have always affirmed, that they did not deny the two natures of Christ, their only object

having been to avoid the danger of Nestorianism. For this reason, the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria used to consecrate the bishop or Abuna of Ethiopia. Other reports say, that there was still a probability that the Ethiopian Church would unite again with the catholic Church, until the Mohammedans reduced Egypt in the seventh century, when for about eighty years there was no Melchitic, i. e., catholic bishop of Alexandria, but only a Coptic. Thus the separation, which had taken place before, was confirmed.

How far the missionary operations of the Ethiopian Church extended, is not exactly known. They introduced Christianity into Meroë, on the North, but *when* this was done can not be ascertained. The Nubian historian, Selim el Assuany, in the tenth century, says, that the inhabitants of the island of Aloa (Meroë, Shendy) were Jacobites, who got their bishops from Alexandria, and had translated the Bible into their own from the Greek language. Elmacin also speaks of all Nubia as a Jacobitic-Christian country in the fourteenth century. As late as the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the Mohammedans were only tolerated here; but in the sixteenth century the coasts were conquered by the Turks from Arabia, who soon made themselves masters of the whole country. Christianity disappeared now, and Abyssinia was isolated from both Egypt and the rest of the Christian world. Toward the West the Christian religion seems not to have spread; the Funga negroes remained pagans. But along the Eastern coasts Christianity flourished, and in the South was the bishopric of Adule. The influence of the Ethiopian Church extended as far as Koffa and Narea, perhaps even as far as central Africa; for up to this very day the Ethiopians speak of Christians, that live at a great distance in central Africa.

There is an Ethiopian translation of the Bible extant—the old vernacular language of the Axumitic empire, called by the natives the Geez-language,—which is still the only authorized version in use, although the Ethiopic language has long ago ceased to be spoken by the people. *When* and

by whom this translation was made, is not known. It is true, the Abyssinians say, that it was made by their first bishop, Frumentius, or by the nine saints, who labored in the fifth century in Abyssinia, from the Arabic; but this tradition is evidently false, since it presupposes an Arabian translation of the Bible before the times of Mohammed. On the contrary, there is conclusive internal evidence that the Ethiopian translation was made from the Greek in the fourth or fifth century. On comparing the two we find an agreement of numberless passages of the Ethiopian version with the Greek text as used by the Church of Alexandria in the fourth century, which contradicts the opinion that the translation was made from any other source. This enables us at the same time to determine the time when this translation was made. For it was only in the first period of Ethiopian literature, that translations were made from the Greek; after the Arabic became the language of Egypt, Ethiopian literature came under the same influence. There are still other reasons for this opinion. Christianity can exist in no country for any length of time without a translation of the Bible into the language of that country, for which reason it has always been one of the first objects of missionaries to translate the Bible into the language of the country which they had converted or wished to convert to Christianity. But we find that in the fifth century Christianity was firmly established in Abyssinia; in the sixth century the great poet and musician, Jared, created the Abyssinian Church-music, and this he could not have done without books. Yea, even Chrysostom seems to have been acquainted with an Ethiopian translation of the Bible. By whom it was made, can not be determined now, nor is it of any importance; but there is internal evidence that it was not made by *one person*, nor at the same time. It is on the whole good, following the Greek almost slavishly; yet so many additions and alterations have been made in the course of time, that some books, especially the four Gospels, resemble paraphrases rather than translations. In 1830 Th. P.

Platt published the New Testament, assisted by the British and Foreign Bible Society; this edition is better than that of Rome, but still full of errors. A critical edition of the whole Old Testament by A. Dillman is now in press.

THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH.

The once powerful kingdom of Abyssinia, situated between the sixteenth and eighth degree of north latitude and the thirty fifth and forty-third of east longitude (from Greenwich) and bounded on the east by the Red Sea, on the north by Sennaar, west and south by Sennaar, Kordofan and barbarous regions, was but lately a prey to anarchy and completely dismembered. Among the various kingdoms into which it was divided, the following were the principal: 1) the northeastern highland, called Tigré; 2) the southeastern highland, Amhara and Shoa, sometimes called Gondar, from the ancient capital; 3) the surrounding low-lands.

The Abyssinian Church is monophysitic and is under the jurisdiction of the Coptic patriarch of Alexandria; many traits of her character are the result of local and other causes. Legendary tales are still repeated by the Abyssinian priests, to the effect that the Abyssinian nation was converted to Judaism by its kings, who descended from Solomon; but the many relics of Judaism, as circumcision before baptism, the arrangement of their Churches, &c., can be accounted for from the fact that the Jews were formerly very numerous in the country, without giving credit to this legend of a conversion of the whole nation to the Jewish religion. But the priests speak also of the nation's conversion to Christianity by Frumentius. "We drink of the well of the patriarch of Alexandria," is one of their favorite sayings, in order to defend their ecclesiastical position. The Symbolum of the Apostles is not known to them. They use the Nicene form of baptism. The Bible, which, however, is only found in convents and among very rich people, is highly esteemed by the priests, but exists invariably in the Ethiopian translation, although the new

Amharic version would be far more intelligible to them. Their exegesis is very romantic and allegorical. One of their commentators, e. g., understands by the foxes, (Matth. 8: 20) kings and governors, but by the birds, bishops and priests, because they rise in their prayers up to God; and by the eye, (Matth. 5: 29) the wife, or child, by the hand, the servant.

Monophysites, by profession, the question concerning the two natures of Christ is settled, Christ having, in their opinion, only one nature, viz: the divine, the human nature being unnecessary to constitute His mediatorial Person. But they are engaged in angry debates about the births of Christ. For the last sixty years the different parties have been engaged in deadly conflict about this question, and the different kingdoms into which the country is divided, have made it a political question. The anointing of Christ with the Holy Ghost is the starting-point of difference. The Abyssinian, who looks upon the humanity of Christ as of but secondary moment, attaching all importance to His divine nature, must logically conclude that the human nature needs no unction of the Holy Ghost. For this reason they refer every thing that is said in the New Testament of the Holy Ghost as communicated to Christ, to His incarnation or birth. The Spirit of God, given to Christ, would accordingly be His divinity. This doctrine, which is consistent with the monophysitic principle, is also thus expressed: Christ anointed Himself. This doctrine is so much insisted upon in Tigré, that an ecclesiastic, who holds a different view, is at once deposed from office. Opposed to this is the doctrine of the three births, one of which is the eternal generation of the Son by the Father, the second, His conception and birth, and the third, His being anointed with the Holy Ghost in the womb of His mother. His unction of the Holy Ghost as belonging to His human nature is called a third birth, because by this His human nature was raised to a higher dignity. As the Abyssinians believe with the whole Greek Church, that the Holy Ghost

proceeds only from the Father, it is a matter of course, that this last view is altogether incompatible with the notion of Christ's anointing Himself. The Holy Ghost is considered as being distinct from the divinity of Christ and as a gift of the Father to the Son. This view is, indeed, less consistent than the former, but places the humanity of Christ in a more correct relation to His divine nature. This is the prevailing doctrine in Amhara and Shoa, and the present king proclaimed publicly by heralds, that whoever opposed this doctrine of the three births would subject himself to banishment and his property to confiscation. But this doctrine was opposed by the Abuna of Gondor, who advocated the opposite view prevailing in Tigré. A new controversy has grown out of this, since the eunuch Aroc of Gondor taught, in order to support the third birth of Christ, that the human soul possessed self-consciousness already in the womb, and a knowledge of good and evil, even fasted and prayed there already. The most influential priests, the Etshege or general of the monks of Debra Libanos and his abbot (Alaca) favored this doctrine; the king supported it and deposed many priests that opposed it. But the persecuted hurled anathemas against the victorious party, and a civil war was the consequence.

Another subject in dispute, was the question, whether Christ in Heaven adored the Father, or whether He is coordinate and rules the world jointly with Him. The king and the ruling party taught that Christ praises the Father. In the last place, they disputed about Mary, whether she ought to be called "mother of God," (Waladita Amlak) or only mother of Jesus, and whether she is entitled to the same worship as the Son. The party in Ankobar and Debra Libanos maintains, that the Son alone ought to be adored, (wa lawold magsat), while their opponents in Fattygar are called Masle Wold (like the Son). These were the controversies concerning the doctrine of the three births; but the political aspect of the country having changed, the victorious party has crushed the belief in the three births.

Another opinion is, that the Holy Ghost was only the mediator between the divine and human natures of Christ. According to Abba Gregory (theologia aethiopica in Fabricii salutaris lux evangelii) the peculiar phraseology: "the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and takes from the Son," (John 14: 15) is current in Abyssinia.—They believe in a kind of purgatory. Persons that are excommunicated for great offences, and die in this state, go into sheol, and remain there until they are delivered by fasts and prayers, but especially by masses said in their behalf. Michael, the archangel, is called upon as the conductor of souls from sheol into heaven. A kind of chiliasm prevails, and a certain Theodotus is expected to establish at the end of days a kingdom of perfect children.

Children of both sexes are circumcised between the third and the eighth day after birth, and then follows baptism, not always immediately, but in every case before the tenth day after birth. The rite consists in prayers, exorcism, immersion, benediction, turning of the individual baptized to the four quarters of the heavens, imposition of hands, and anointing with the holy oil. Sponsors are necessary. Adults are baptized by having water poured over them. Hymns are sung in honor of the Virgin Mary, the Nicene Creed, the Lord's Prayer and third chapter of John are read; the water in the basin is consecrated with incense, and the pronunciation of the following words: "Praised be the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost;" an iron cross is drawn three times through the water, with the words: "A holy Father, a holy Son, and a Holy Ghost." Cotton cords are dipped in the sacred oil and therewith the sign of the cross is made on the forehead of the person baptized, and one of the cords is hung around his neck; then the communion follows. The Abyssinian Christian carries a blue silk cord through life around his neck in remembrance of his baptism and as a mark of distinction from Jews and Mohammedans. Jews and Mohammedans that wish to be baptized, commit the Nicene Creed and a

few legends to memory. If they are rich, they build a church, if not, they make the priest a present of some grain. Thus many Gallas have been converted. The ceremony of Baptism is performed outside of the church; the Lord's Supper is administered inside of the church. For the communion unleavened bread, and wine, are used; the priests commune daily, the laity as often as they please. Adults only go to confession before communion, as children and persons under twenty-five years of age are supposed to be guiltless. Infant communion is universal; private communion is unknown. In the same church mass can be said but once a day. The communicants are forbidden to spit before the sun sets. Every one, the priests not excepted, has his confessor, to whom he applies, whenever his conscience accuses him. Children, that are twelve years old, stand in a white dress, which is presented to them, on communion days all day fasting in the church, without understanding the object of the ceremony; for they believe that it is intended to make them grow (physically).

The Abuna or patriarch, is chosen and consecrated by the Patriarch of Alexandria. He is chosen from the Copts, sometimes against his will, instructed and consecrated; and a detachment of soldiers conducts him to his residence, which is in Gondor, but his jurisdiction extends also over the Church in Shoa and Tigré. His salary, which consists in the produce of lands and ordination fees, is very considerable; at one time the third part of the produce of the province was destined for him. His power is limited only by that of the king, but sometimes becomes formidable to the king himself. He ordains by breathing upon the candidates and signing them with the sign of the cross. When in 1842 a new Abuna arrived, after the seat had been vacant for eleven years, he had to ordain one thousand persons a day, who arrived in caravans, from all the provinces, at Gondor. The qualifications for ordination are: the candidates must know how to read Ethiopic, to sing from the book Yared and have a beard, as no one can be ordained before his eighteenth year. The fee is about ten cents. In mat

ters of faith the Abuna is the highest authority, and is sometimes appealed to even in civil cases. Under him are the bishops, whose business, however, is no other than to keep the churches, their vessels, etc., clean and sacred. Next comes the Alaka, who administers the revenues of the church, and receives the presents; and finally the priest, who alone can enter the *sanctissimum*, which is shut even against the deacon. The deacon assists the priests in public worship, and bakes the bread for the Lord's Supper, keeps the church and the vessels clean.

The numerous monasteries of the two orders—that of the celebrated saint Tekla Haimanot and that of saint Eustathius—are under the Etshege of Debra Libanos in Shoa. The monks live as they used to do in Europe during the middle ages; they beg, loiter about, some celebrate public service, dispute about religious questions and say the rosary. They live in celibacy, A cap, a dirty cloth around the head, the skin of an animal, and a leathern girdle, mark the monks. The number of priests and monks in Shoa alone is said to exceed 12,000, whilst that in Gondor is still greater. The most celebrated convents are Debra Libanos in Shoa, St. Stephen on the Haik-lake in Jeschu, Debra Damo and Axum Thion in Tigré and Lalibela in Lasta. To a fully supplied church belong twenty priests and deacons, one third of whom attend to the public services, while the rest instruct some children—their spiritual sons—or live at home with their families. For the priests are allowed to marry, although but once. The churches, which are very numerous, are generally built on hills, shaded by beautiful trees, circular, low, thatched, adorned with a glittering brass crucifix; the walls are poorly built, whitewashed on the outside and furnished with four doors facing the four quarters of the heavens. Inside the building is full of dirt, the walls are covered with abominable pictures of Mary, of angels, devils, etc. Sculptures are forbidden. A vestibule surrounds the whole church, destined for the laity, for the daily morning prayers, and serving needy travelers as a lodging. The inside of the church is

divided into the sanctuary and the sanctissimum. The sanctuary is hung with relics and accessible to the priests and deacons alone. The communion is celebrated here, while the laity are behind a curtain. Women can not come even here. In the sanctissimum, behind a curtain, is the ark of the covenant, with a parchment on which the name of the tutelary saint of the church is written. Here only the Alaca and the priests enter. The ark is anointed with the sacred oil (Maron) and can not be touched even by the deacon; if this is done, the ark and the whole church must be consecrated anew. For on this ark the sacredness of the house and of the surrounding burial ground depends.

The public services consist of singing psalms, reading portions of Scripture and parts of martyrologies, the priests dancing all the while and beating violently with their canes. The prayers are principally addressed to Mary, the nine saints that established Christianity in the country, Frumentius, angels and other saints. Every beggar appeals to one of the many saints, in order to call forth sympathy, but Mary is honored above all the rest, and called even "the creatrix of the world." Combes and Tamisier (Voyage in Abyss., IV., 159) give a list of one hundred and five saints from the Old and New Testaments, the Greek, Egyptian and Ethiopian Churches and legends. The most absurd stories are current among the people, e. g., that mineral springs were formed, savage beasts tamed, lions harnessed by the saints uttering but one word, that a roasted child was restored to life, that Mohammed, the prophet, was present as a demoniac at the council of Nice, etc.

The Abyssinian Church keeps both the Jewish Sabbath and the Christian Sunday, calling the latter the great Sabbath, and has no less than one hundred and eighty festivals a year. The most prominent of these festive days are, beside those which the Church universally observes, the day of Epiphany, on the 18th of January, the three festivals of Tekla Haimanot in May, August and December, commemorative of his ascension, death and birth. On the festival

of Epiphany the priests march with all the arks of the town and neighborhood to a rivulet or river an the festival commences with singing and shouting; the poor receive presents. By the light of torches, at midnight, a priest descends into the water and blesses it, whereupon the whole crowd, old and young, parents and children, plunge into the river, in order to bathe, and an almost hellish noise and tumult follow. On one of the Tekla festivals thousands make pilgrimages to Debra Libanos in order to get some of the dust from the graves of the saints, which is supposed to prevent or cure diseases; or to drink the water of the mineral springs, which are to be found there.

Fasting is regarded the great means of salvation, and consequently is more rigidly observed than by any other Church. Every Wednesday and Friday, as well as every communion day, is a day of fasting, on which it is unlawful to eat anything but nettles and dry bread: add to these the Hodad or Kabala fast of forty days, the Kenoua fast in April of three days, the twelve to fifteen days' fast in June, the Niniae fast of three days in July, a fast of sixteen days in August, so that the pious Abyssinian has to keep about two hundred fasts a year. It is true, that many of them are not kept, and still many more would be violated, if burial in consecrated ground did not depend on the religious observance of these fast days.

Meritorious works are: alms to beggars, pilgrims, monks and priests, that are given by the donor "for his own works' sake," presents to churches and convents, especially the building of new or the repairing of old churches, pilgrimages to the sacred places in the land, to Debra Libanos, St. Stephen, Debra Damo; but whoever makes a pilgrimage to Jerusalem is a saint, and miraculous cures are expected to be performed by him. In this respect the Abyssinian Church is really Pagan, magic and the superstition about armlets being as much practiced by her members as by Pagans or Mohammedans. Superstition has almost extinguished Christian elements. The enactments of the Mosaic law concerning clean and unclean food are scrupu-

lously observed. The Abyssinian, moreover, abhors the use of coffee, fearing, that even by touching it, he would place himself on an equal footing with the Mohammedan.

Matrimonial relations are generally entered into without the intervention of the priests, and are, for this very reason, easily dissolved again, provided a man marries not more than four women in succession. Some marriages, however, can not be dissolved, having been sealed with the Eucharist. Marriage is annulled by the priest. Whoever has married or dismissed four women, is excommunicated, unless he becomes a monk. Marriage relations are dissolved also by the husband turning monk, without saying one word to the priest, his poor wife and children being left to care for themselves. Polygamy is, indeed, forbidden, but the kings and great ones have often three or four wives at the same time, and a number of concubines besides.

Shortly before death the priest is generally sent for in order to hear confession and impart absolution to the sick; and this he never fails to do, if his relatives promise to give a due proportion of alms and to do penance; a part of this penance being often done by the priest himself for pay. If the deceased be rich, feasts of penance are celebrated, that last for some time. Burials take place immediately after death with Jewish lamentations and funeral feasts in or near the church, the priests assisting. Portions of the Bible are read, and the crucifix heads the procession.

The many Jewish elements in the Abyssinian Church, as circumcision, the Sabbath, forbidden meals, fasts, lamentations at funerals, the ark of the covenant, division of the churches after the style of the Jewish Temple, and other customs, may easily be accounted for without giving credence to their own notion, that their kings are of Jewish extraction and that they were once Jews themselves. The character of the Church, to which Abyssinia owes its conversion, the influence of Egypt, the Arabian origin of the Abyssinian people, the near relation between Jews and Arabs as to customs and manners, the proximity of Jewish

Christians—the Homerites and Adulitanians—the influence of the Old Testament, which the priests pray and sing (the psalms), the four centuries of Jewish rule, the intermingling with Jews and Mohammedans, and man's propensity to outward legalism in matters of religion ;—all account fully for these Jewish elements.

The moral and religious character of the Abyssinians is lamentable. Indifference to the substance of religion—saving faith ; moral laxity and laziness are their principal traits. The ignorance of both priests and laymen, the bad example of the former who are rarely surpassed in lying, cunning and avarice, the many festivals that necessarily engender laziness; the political confusion; the mixture with Jews and Mohammedans;—all these things exert a disasterous influence. But lewdness and lasciviousness are the inveterate vices of the nation. There are still remnants of gross idolatry visible. The sects are but insignificant; the Jews are numerous, but much less so than formerly.

Pains have been taken for some time to raise the moral and religious standing of the Abyssinians. In 1808 the French consul at Alexandria, Monsieur Asselin, engaged the noble Abyssinian Abreka, the companion of Bruce, to translate the Ethiopian Old and New Testaments into Amharic, and this translation was executed in ten years with skill and fidelity. Mr. Jowett, an English clergyman, saw and bought this manuscript for the British and Foreign Missionary Society. Before the whole of this translation had been published (the four Gospels and Acts, 1822), Mr. Jowett succeeded in having two Gospels translated into the Tigré language by Pearce. Now the English Episcopal Missionary Society resolved to establish a mission in Abyssinia, and Samuel Gobat, now Bishop of Jerusalem, and Mr. Kugler were sent, and arrived there in 1830. But Mr. Kugler died, and Gobat had to return to Europe for help. His strictly evangelical method of operation made a very favorable impression upon princes, priests and the people, and the foundation of an evangelical reformation had evidently been laid by him, the assertions of Baron von

Katte to the contrary notwithstanding. Gobat returned with Isenberg, followed by Blumhard and Krapf, but had to leave again on account of sickness, and the other missionaries did not get beyond Tigré on account of the political convulsions of the country. Through the intrigues of the Italian missionary, Sapeta, the English missionaries were banished in 1838, and one year afterward the other missionaries had to follow them. The present Abuna, Abba Salama, is a pupil of the English protestant mission of Cairo; but, influenced by the Jesuites, the Etshege and the greater part of the clergy, turned against him and pronounced the sentence of deposition against him. He protested, but had to flee from Gondor and take refuge in a cloister in Tigré, till Cassai,—now king Theodorus—made himself king of Amhara. He recalled and reinstated the exiled Abuna, and banished the Jesuits at once. In 1854 Tigré was also conquered by king Theodorus, and the Jesuits had to leave it also.

The cöoperation of the ecclesiastical and the political government of Abyssinia seems to be completely harmonious at present. The king is revered by the priests, and still more by the people, as a kind of Paraclete, and is regarded as that Theodotus, who will come, at the end of days, to establish a kingdom of perfect children. In 1855 bishop Gobat sent the three missionaries, Krapf, Martin and Flad to the king, to offer him "useful people"—mechanics, and to treat with him concerning the re-opening of a mission. They reached his camp, April 19th, were introduced at once to the Abuna, who accompanies the king on his military expeditions, and the day following had an audience of the king. Both the king and the Abuna received them very kindly; the offer of mechanics, as made by Gobat, was thankfully received, and for a beginning, three mechanics, viz: a printer, an architect, and a gunsmith were asked for. Should he—the king—be satisfied with them, and they with him, he would send for more. The king sent the following letter to bishop Gobat: "May this letter, which is sent by Theodorus, the God-ordained

king of kings (of Ethiopia) reach the English bishop, Gobat, of Jerusalem. Art thou well? The letter, which thou hast sent me through Krapf, Martin and Flad, I have received. I have been pleased, that thou inquirest after me. If these men remain (with thee), keep them, and if they come send them to me. And if the men, of whom thou hast spoken, say, we will go (to Abyssinia) I will receive and send them in love. I am pleased that thou sayest, I will send thee laborers (mechanics); send them to me. But thou knowest the condition of our country, in which thou wast. We were formerly divided into three parties (about the three births), but now I have brought about unity, with the help of God. Priests, who subvert our faith, shall not come, lest love cease. Formerly the so-called Pater Jacob came and annulled (our baptism) and ordination, substituting his in their place and causing many to apostatize. But, with the help of God, I have expelled and banished him. But if another priest comes, I will receive him kindly and send him back kindly, and if he wishes to remain, I shall cheerfully grant him permission to remain (in my country.) One of the laborers shall bring the thing that plows with a fire screw, for I have heard that there is such a thing as plows with a fire-screw (steam-plow). And thou inquire after me and I shall inquire after thee. In order to please God, I forbade, through the herald, the slave trade, two years ago."

This change for the better has induced a number of German missionary societies to turn their attention anew to Abyssinia, but nothing decisive will be done in the matter, as we are informed, until full information is obtained concerning the state of affairs through bishop Gobat, who is expected to attend the Christian Alliance in Berlin this year.

THE ARMENIAN CHURCH.

The Christian religion was introduced into Armenia in the second century, and universally established in the third, under Tiridates, by Gregory the Iluminator. The Bible was translated (the Old Testament from the LXX) into

Armenian about 410, by Mesrob, the inventor of the Armenian Alphabet, and his two pupils, John Ekelensis and Joseph Planensis. The Armenian church separated in the sixth and seventh centuries from the Catholic (church) and adopted the monophysitic tenets. Their creed is as follows:

"We profess and believe in God the Father, who is uncreated, without beginning, who begets the Son and sends the Holy Ghost. We believe in God the Word, not created, but begotten by the Father from all eternity. We believe in God the Holy Ghost, who is uncreated, not begotten, but proceeds from the Father and partakes of the Son's glory. We believe in the Holy Trinity, one substance, one Deity, not three Gods, but one God, one will, one kingdom, one power, Creator of all things. We believe in the forgiveness of sins, in the Holy Church, and in the communion of saints. We believe, that one of the three persons, the Word, begotten of the Father before all eternity, descended in the fulness of time to our earth and became, although he was perfect God, a perfect man with spirit, soul and body, one person, one Attribute, and one common nature; God became man without change. As there is no beginning of his divinity, so there is no end of his humanity. For Jesus Christ is the same yesterday today and the same in all eternity. His body, united with His divinity, was laid in the grave, and in spirit, united with His divinity, He descended into hell, preached to the spirits, destroyed hell and set the spirits free. We believe, that our Lord Jesus Christ ascended with the same body into heaven and sat down at the right hand of the Father; in the same body He will come again. We believe in a reward of works, everlasting life of the righteous, and everlasting misery of the wicked."

An independent Armenian state has not existed for many centuries; since the Russians have conquered the province of Eriwan the centre of the Armenian Church has been in Russia; but there are many Armenians also in other provinces of Russia, in Turkey, in India and in Austria. The Armenians remind one of the Jews; they have, (like them,) no political independence, are scattered over many

countries, are oppressed and persecuted wherever they are, follow mercantile pursuits, etc. The Armenian Church is divided into two hostile parts or factions, viz: the Armenians properly so called, who reject the supremacy of the bishop of Rome; and the united Armenians, who recognize it. The latter have patriarchs at Venice, Constantinople and Lemberg, and a celebrated convent near Venice, San Lazaro. We shall confine ourselves in this article to the Armenians properly so-called. They believe with the orthodox Greek Church, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father alone, that Christ has saved us from original sin, and that this salvation is appropriated by baptism; actual sins are remitted through confession. They have the same sacraments which the Church of Rome has, and attach great importance to fasting. Their motto is: "By Adam's eating we have been made worldly; we must, therefore, fast again, 'that we may return to our original being and lay aside our worldliness." As to alms, one particular form is this: they go on a Sunday or festival to a certain holy place, have a sheep consecrated by the priest with salt and prayer, which they afterwards kill, partly eat themselves, and partly give to the priest and the poor. This sacrifice is said to date from the times of Gregory, and an atoning power is claimed for it. Baptism is administered by immersion, and is followed by confirmation and extreme unction. They believe in transubstantiation and consider the mass as a real sacrifice. They pray to the saints, especially to the Virgin Mary;—whilst they reject the Catholic doctrine of purgatory, they believe in an intermediate state.

At the head of the Armenian Church stands the Catholicos, who resides in the convent Echmiadzin, near Eriwan, and is appointed by the (Russian) Emperor from a number of persons proposed by the archbishops as fit for the post. The Catholicos, is assisted by a committee of five Bishops and Vartabeds, who discuss the affairs of the Church and thus exert great influence. The Catholicos has the exclusive right to consecrate the holy oil, and derives large revenues from the sale of this article. Next to him are the

archbishops or metropolitans, who reside for the most part, likewise, in convents; then follow the Vartabeds or doctors, who are said to be well versed in the Old and New Testament and the doctrines of their Church; preaching is their exclusive calling.

The priests, who are married, but only once, are chosen by the congregations and receive tithes, perquisites and presents. Their priesthood has seven degrees, viz: priest, deacon, sub-deacon, torch-bearer, exorcist, reader and janitor. In order to become priest, the candidate must be twenty-five years of age. They have many convents, all of the order of St. Basilius, from which the Vartabeds proceed.

The reports concerning the condition of the Armenian Church are, on the whole, unfavorable. To some protestant missionaries, who represented to an Armenian bishop, that it was the duty of the Armenian Church to labor for the conversion of the Turks, he is said to have replied: "What shall we preach to the Mohammedans? for they believe in the same God in which we believe, and love good prayers." The missionaries urged, that there was a great difference between Christianity and Islamism, and that the heaven of the Christian religion is infinitely purer than the paradise of the Mohammedans. Then the bishop replied: "I must tell you, what one of our Vartabeds once said to a Moslem: if I were sure that your paradise really existed, I should wish to be there." For several decades protestant missionaries have labored for the amelioration of the religious condition of the Armenians, and there are small Armenian protestant societies at Constantinople, Brusa, Trebizond, Erzroom, Aintab, Ada-Basar, Nicomedia and other places. Many evangelical Armenians have become missionaries amongst their countrymen. In Bebek, near Constantinople, there is a seminary for the education of Armenians, and many missionaries have been trained there already. It is true, the evangelical Armenians form as yet but a small minority, but there is reason to hope, that they will work like leaven amongst their countrymen.

ART. VII.—EVERY MAN IS THE LORD'S IN DEATH: A DISCOURSE BY DR. RAUCH.

"For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; and whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's." Rom. 14: 8.

PART SECOND.*

I intend to prove to-day from the latter part of my text,

1. That the sinner, when he dies is the Lord's, and will be judged by Him; and

2. That the believer is the Lord's when he dies, though in a sense entirely different from that of the former.

First, then, I shall endeavor to prove that the sinner is the Lord's when he dies, although he does not acknowledge it.

The *whole* life of man is enveloped in darkness, but its duration and its exit still more so. Whilst imagining himself the master and lord of his life, of his destiny, of his actions and plans, the sinner must nevertheless sooner or later experience, that, whatever he may undertake and complete during his life, in death he is no longer master of himself; or does any one of us know even when his last hour will approach; when he shall see for the last time the cheerful light of the sun, and enjoy for the last time the well known countenance of his friends and relatives on earth; when he shall part with the sweet habit of conversing with his acquaintances? His last hour is appointed in the councils of Him, that gave him life and existence, but he does not know it. The place whither he will be called; the circumstances under which, and the age of his life, when he must depart; all were determined upon before he was born, but he was not consulted and does not know them. Death approaches him unsuspectedly. Whilst in the midst of plans; whilst he, in his imagination and in the vigor of

* For Part First see the April Number, 1859, p. 222.

health, calculates on enjoyments in after years; whilst his ever-blooming hopes urge his mind forward to enter new occupations, to engage in new schemes of activity, he is like the lamb that plays when the sun sets, but is sacrificed on the following morning. He lives and never thinks of death; he walks on the ashes of his departed friends and sees his own grave, but continues to act as if he should live forever. Proud mortal! you feel yourself a free, an active, a reasonable, a considerate being during life, but in that momentous hour, which your thoughts abhor, when you must part with this world and enter another, you are no longer free, no longer active, no longer considerate. You feel yourself strong and full of invention and art, but that power, which calls you, you do not know whither, is invisible to your eye, and irresistible to your hand. You must follow its call, for you are not your own master; you must go into eternity, though you never think of it. No ties that you have formed on earth, no calls and claims, no wishes or tears, no strength, no designs can protect you from this invisible power: it beckons and without being consulted you must follow; it touches you and you sink a corpse. Are you not the servant of a higher master?

Who of us could or would deny the fact, that none of us is his own master in that mournful moment when at once, by one stroke, the blood ceases to circulate, the heart to beat, and the spirit of life to act; when the eye is sealed, the ear deaf, and the limbs are cold; when friends, children, parents, sisters and brothers stand around the bed anxiously awaiting that life perhaps may return, that the eye may open, the heart beat again; when it seems impossible that he who a little before still felt, thought, acted, should be gone forever, that his soul should be separated by immense space from them and perhaps neither see their tears nor hear their sighs? Man is no longer his master in that mournful hour, when we follow his remains to the grave to inter them in the narrow and solitary house. From that hour silence, deep silence, reigns around his grave, and no sound reaches our ear from below the earth.

He has gone to the shores of eternity, without knowing the path; for he was the Lord's when he died and He led him. He was for us as long as he lived, now he is no more for us. His body begins to be changed and repels all the living from it, to prove that he is now under the law of a Being over whom he has no command, and that it is in vain to weep and mourn whenever the face of man has disappeared.

How well is this truth calculated to teach us that we are all the Lord's. Old and young; he whose head bends towards the earth, and he whose mind teems with hopes and expectation—all die without distinction. Every moment calls thousands into existence and sends thousands into the grave; and of those many thousands who dare say that he will not be one now or but a little hereafter? O let us live unto the Lord, that we may die unto him!

Dying, the sinner is the Lord's, *though against his will and wishes.* The materialist and the pantheist, the infidel and the sceptic, all are united in the wish, that when the soul leaves the body, it may be destroyed. Though they have the consent of all nations against them, yet their life, their character, their sensual will, can not endure the idea that the soul is the Lord's, and that He calls it when we die. As little as the insanity of many thousands can prove any thing against the generality of human reason, so little, it is true, should the arguments of a few materialists against the immortality of the soul be able to alarm us; it is, therefore, not on account of the believer, but on account of the sinner, that I have determined to review a few of their doubts and assertions.

And here I must allude, above all, to Pliny, the elder, whose learning was great, whose works were known among the ancients, and what is left of them excites even now our astonishment; yet his arguments for the annihilation of the soul are puerile and ridiculous. What—he asks—is the soul good for without eyes and ears, if it can not smell nor taste? And where shall place enough be found for so many souls? Such arguments deserve certainly no refu-

tation, and yet it is a fact, that can not be denied, that nearly all the reasons of the materialist essentially terminate in this puerile idea. The body, they say, the organ of the soul, conditions the life of the latter. On the strength and energy of our nerves and muscles depends that of our will and our thoughts; when they grow weak, our faculties grow dull, the memory fails, and the vigor of our judgment diminishes; when we lose one of our limbs the soul is deprived of those sensations and perceptions which were obtained by impressions on the lost member; and when the whole body is destroyed, it follows that the soul will be extinguished like a light, since what is true of a part must be true also of the whole.

This is the highest point of the materialist's arguments, and whilst I am willing to admit, that the soul is so constituted that it is active through organs, and that it could not reach its destination independently of them, I must insist, at the same time, on the strictest distinction between a power that acts through organs and the organs themselves. The organs serve the soul and differ from it as the instrument on which the artist plays, differs from his art. When the organ is destroyed, the power that acted through it, remains still the same power, though its activity may seem to be impaired. That when our organs grow weak our memory and judgment grow dull, is but one part of our experience; the other is, that just in the moment of death the long lost faculties frequently obtain their youthful vigor anew; that the dying man can speak languages which he had forgotten; that all his faculties concentrated on one point, as if freed from all earthly chains, victoriously rise to a height which they never would have been able to reach in the time when muscles and nerves were strongest. When one of our organs suffers partial insanity takes place, says the materialist; but what this fact goes to prove he overlooks; the very insanity is a continuance of the activity of the soul which, though acting through organs, acts also independently of them. When a limb is lost the feelings and sensations the person had through

it, are lost likewise, and yet experience proves that men who have lost a hand, feel in it every change of weather and even pains, as if it were yet in connexion with the arm. To be sure, this is imagination ; but imagination is neither nerve nor brain ; it is an activity of the soul. As little as our faculties harden with the brain in the skull, so little is the soul but bone and sinew ; for if it were, how should men that had lost one of their faculties during some part of their life, regain it just at a time when it could be least expected. Let us ask the physician, whether the body, with all its fibres and elements, does not undergo constant changes, and yet our mental faculties remain the same. Let us ask him whether he has never met with men, who, by strange misfortunes, had lost one member after the other, until nothing was left but head and breast, and yet they were mentally the same that they always had been. History records instances where important portions of the brain were destroyed, and some, where the whole brain was removed, yet the mind was still active.

The soul is neither the brain nor a system of nerves and muscles ; it is spirit, and whilst our body, a living composition, each particle of which is animated and has a particular design, may be subject to death and be dissolved into its original elements, the soul is no composition : it is something entirely internal, invisible, immaterial, spiritual, not subject to changes, neither in space, for it has no extension ; nor in time, for that which is entirely simple has no succession. Death is separation ; but can that be separated which does not consist of parts ? Death reigns only where it can cause separation ; over the soul it has no dominion, for it consists not of plurality, though its faculties are many, but of a unity of all of them. But further: though death, this dreadful destroyer of all, may decompose, it can not annihilate a single atom ; all that dies and decays in nature, passes only from one form into another ; every particle enters a new combination, a new life ; and is the soul, the power of thought, the consciousness of ourselves and our Lord—the soul, for which the body was created, alone capable of being annihilated ?

But what is the soul? the materialist asks. We reply: You think, you will, you resolve, you act; do you need a further proof of what your soul is? It is neither light, nor flame, nor fire; nor air, nor breath; it is nothing that can be seen, or heard, or perceived by the senses, or represented by pictures;—it is not confined to space, nor to time; it mocks at distance; it scorns mere external form; now it is beyond the stars and suns, and now again within itself; now it wills something and without loss of time it acts through the arm. A passion rises in it, a wish, a desire, and all veins beat higher, the heart swells, the blood rolls, the nerves are invigorated and the will of the soul passes through the whole body with the swiftness of lightning. Now it calls forth the remembrance of by-gone ages, thinks eternity, and creates a world of spirits and beings which it never has seen. It is the soul that unites the many impressions received into one thought and brings the many individual things under one head; it was the soul, and not the eye that, when the apple fell in a happy moment, discovered the law of gravity. And this soul that by one great idea triumphs even over the pains of death, can it be annihilated?

There is some flaw in this lifeless, sensual system of materialism, which made even La Mettrie confess, that he could not find in his mind a consoling idea. "*If I am, thou art not, and if thou art, I am not*; and in neither case do I need to fear thee." This would be the keen expression of the infidel, but La Mettrie could not say so, for he did not and could not believe in his own system.

But there is another class of sinners that cannot convince themselves, that when they die, they are the Lord's. Whilst the materialist and the pantheist deny the immortality of the soul, because they suffer from relaxation and weakness, because they are satisfied with their merely sensual life and entertain the principle that man's destination is to live, to enjoy himself, to be useful and to die; because they fear the doctrines of the gospel and a meeting with the Saviour as the Judge of the world;—there are those

who would believe, if they could only convince themselves by their eyes and senses. For six thousand years death has kept silence; we have buried our children and parents, our most beloved friends and relatives from year to year—but around their graves no sound of life is to be heard, the house of the dead is dark and cold and never gives back its inhabitant. This it is, that they can not understand. If their souls live, where are they? Why do they not appear to us? If we are born for immortality, why are we forbidden to cast a glance into the world beyond the stars?

To answer these really important questions, I might direct your attention to nature and show how a wise and kind Providence has every where given us as much as was necessary and neither *more* nor *less*. All the gifts of the animal are calculated according to its wants, and whilst the Deity was not parsimonious in giving those necessary for its existence, neither was he prodigal in granting such as would have been of no immediate use. The wandering bird, that passes from one country to another, knows nothing of its clime, of its productions, of the path that leads thither; yet yielding to the impulse it feels to commence its migration, it enters upon it and reaches the country. Would the same bird, if it knew the dangers awaiting it, the labor and fatigue resulting from its journey, not perhaps rather choose to remain back, and thus by encountering privations which its constitution was not made to endure, find an early death? Yet I do not wish to gain my point by the easy way of a comparison, and shall therefore ask: Why is it, that there is no connexion between the dead and the living?

We all are called to act out the design which God had in view in creating this world. Each one of us occupies his place by divine Providence, not by his own choice; and though none of us may carry out his own designs and plans, yet as a link in the great chain, he on his part promotes the general design of God. But what man would desire any longer to remain and work in this world, after he had once cast a glance into eternity? Having seen the glories

of heaven we would forget the work which is our daily duty; we would scorn those pleasures, which constitute a part of our earthly existence; we would find those hopes insignificant, which we must entertain to live and to breathe; we would think it superfluous to project plans for the future; and our diligence and cheerfulness in this world would be gone. We are born to be citizens of two worlds; of the world below and of that above; both these worlds are separated from each other by fixed limits, and that which unites them is *love*, *faith* and *hope*. Whilst we live on earth, it is our destination to act out the plan of God on earth, and to look forth into the world to come with the eye of faith. Lest we should become confused, lest our souls should receive impressions that might disturb their peace, follow them day and night and render them unfit for duties on earth—God has kindly hidden from mortal eye what he has prepared for man in eternity.

Again: suppose we were permitted to see the fate of our beloved friends in eternity, could we do so without participating in it? Would we not feel with them? Perhaps some of them have to suffer punishment—if we truly love them, would we be strong enough to bear this grief? Would not the painful feeling of compassion embitter the enjoyments of life? Now we know that the dead are the Lord's, and though the Scriptures are no where explicit as to the condition of the departed from the time of death till the day of judgment, we know that they are in the hands of a just but merciful, of a holy but loving, Father; that those who die in the Lord will rest in the Lord, will be with the Lord.

Yet we are foolish and ignorant mortals. We can not calculate with certainty on events, that will occur in a few days, and we desire to look into eternity. We, made of flesh and bones, desire to know the fate and destinies of those who no more are flesh and blood, who now serve higher purposes of our Creator. We can not compass the kingdom of God on earth, nor review His plans which are before us; yet we are anxious to understand all about God's

kingdom in Heaven, and if we are denied this understanding we have no courage to believe, but doubt and hesitate.

Much stronger than all the arguments of the sinner against the immortality of the soul, are the demands of reason for it.

Every faculty of the soul conceals in itself the germ of eternity; the design for which the soul was created, never being realized on earth, demands a life after death. The animal possesses all its skill, all its abilities and the use of all its members from the very commencement of its life, and whether it dies early or late, its destiny has been fulfilled. But the soul, when it has reached the highest degree of cultivation, is still infinitely perfectible; and in proportion as it develops itself does its perfection appear still more remote. Without immortality we would, therefore, never realize our original design. We have ideas of truth, of virtue, of absolute love: but as long as we live on earth, they exist only in idea, and not in reality. Eternity alone can realize them.

And this remark is not isolated: nature has a number of parallels. Many animals destined to pass from a lower to a higher state of development, have organs which they do not stand in need of until they are transformed. This we find to be the case especially among insects; natural philosophers give it as a general rule, that every original disposition and natural tendency finds its time and place of perfection. The tortoise, which is hatched several miles from the sea, runs down in a straight line, without a teacher, into the water in which it never has been. The migratory bird, following the current of the atmosphere and its own instinct, seeks and finds a new country. Every want has its means of satisfaction; the lungs have the air adapted to breathing, and the eye has the light adapted to sight; but shall that longing and desire which man has, remain unsatisfied?

We see further, that the noblest purposes have never been carried into effect, that the purest feelings are of the shortest duration; and when in history we meet now and then with a wise and good man who scattered his thoughts

and counsels and deeds into the flood of time, we perceive but a few waves circling around them, and shortly after the stream tearing them away and leaving no vestige behind. We see that fools reign over the councils of the wise, that profligates inherit the property of prudent parents, that the righteous suffer and the wicked frequently enjoy honor and happiness on earth: we feel that this is not right, and shall there be no state in which all shall be made equal, and every one receive according to his works?

Finally, we, alone of all that lives on earth, know that we must die; we fear death as a dire necessity; and feeling averse to destruction, we long for immortality. Should God, who deceives none of his creatures, have planted in our nature this longing, without being willing to satisfy it? We are able to conceive an eternity and shall we never obtain it? No, the very thought of eternity is the earnest of eternity itself; and however the sinner may desire the opposite, when he dies he must live again; he passes only from the scenes of this world to appear before his Master, who gave him life and to whom he must render an account of all that he has done. He is the Lord's when he lives; he is the Lord's when he dies. This truth he must hear, and tremble; he wills it not, and yet he can not deny it. It is a necessity which he can not avoid by any power of earth or of hell. As certain as it is that he must die, so certain it is, that he must live again, for he must be judged.

II.

We have seen that the sinner is the Lord's when he dies, though against his will; for if it were in his power or choice, he would rather be destroyed forever, than fall into the hands of the living God. In a sense diametrically opposed to this is the Christian, the true believer—the Lord's. He has been purchased by the blood of Christ and is His thus; he has been regenerated by the agency of the Holy Spirit; his will has been divested of all egotism; his breast has been filled with love; eternal heavenly love to Him who redeemed him, and hence he is the Lord's internally by his own will and desire. Christ is the centre of all his

activity; and whatever he does, has a bearing on Christ's cause. The Father's will is the Christian's will; all opposition has been removed and the whole life of the believer is a spiritual one, is a dying in the Lord. Nevertheless he lives, yet not he, but Christ lives in him, and the life which he now lives in the flesh, he lives by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave Himself for him. When his last hour approaches, he sinks into the hands not of a strange God, but of his Master, matured for eternity, full of desire to enter his home, full of hope to participate in the praises and hallelujahs which angels sing to the Lord of creation. His soul rises, therefore, the more free and easy on the wings of faith, the deeper time and space sink below it. His is the salvation of which those will partake who on earth were members of Christ's kingdom. He will see the King of all heavens, the Lamb full of meekness and kindness, the elect multitude, chosen to reign with Him, saints, angels and archangels, all of whom praise and adore Him.

This is the hope that raises the spirit of the dying Christian, that makes him say: whether I die, or whether I live, I am the Lord's. And this is not merely a picture sketched by imagination, but a promise, given to believers by the Gospel. Paul in many places warns the sinner to be watchful, since the day of the Lord will so come as a thief in the night; in others he teaches, in accordance with Christ's own words, that He will descend from Heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God; the dead in Christ shall rise first, and those which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air and so shall they ever be with the Lord. Not only does he teach the immortality of the soul, but distinctly too the resurrection of the body. In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality. The soul shall then continue to be not without a body, but

the body it will receive will be a spiritual, a heavenly one. And when Christ comes on that day, He will not only awaken men from death, but sit in judgment on every idle word that men have spoken; they will have to give an account, and He will render to every man according to his deeds, to them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for glory and honor and immortality—eternal life; but unto them that are contentious and do not obey the truth, but obey unrighteousness—indignation and wrath. And glorious will He be in His judgment, invested with the power of the Father. And I saw a great white throne and Him that sat on it, from whose face the heaven and the earth fled away and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, standing before God: and the books were opened: among them the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to his works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire. (Rev. 20: 11–15.)

What power! Earth and heaven flee before Him; and in the immense, empty space He sits on His throne, and around Him are the hosts of the dead waiting to be judged; finally death and the kingdom of darkness appear before Him and are cast into the eternal lake of fire. For that is the end, that Christ shall reign until all His enemies shall be made his footstool; and he that has the power of death shall be destroyed. And after all that is evil has been sunk into eternal night, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying; for the former things are passed away."

But who are those that will enter this new Jerusalem and inherit this heavenly blessedness? "They which came out of great tribulation and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb. Therefore are

they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night in His temple: and He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more, neither shall the sun light on them, nor any heat. For the Lamb, which is in the midst of the throne, shall feed them and shall lead them unto living fountains of waters." And what will be this New Jerusalem? The building of the wall of it was of jasper and the city was of pure gold and like unto clear glass. And the foundations of the wall of the city were garnished with all manner of precious stones. And the twelve gates were twelve pearls; every several gate was of one pearl. And there shall be no night there; and they need no candle, neither light of the sun; for the Lord God giveth them light. And he showed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb; in the midst of the street of it and on either side of the river was there the tree of life, which bear twelve manner of fruits and yielded her fruit every month: and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.

Are these but pictures? Or do they represent the renovation of all nature, which, according to Paul, waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God? Does not the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews say the same thing? But you are come unto mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and Church of the first born, which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the spirits of just men made perfect. John the divine, himself says: He that sat on the throne, said, Behold, I make all things new. And he said unto me, write: for these words are faithful and true. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last.

Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.

Art. VIII.—RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

On Civil Liberty and Self-Government. By Francis Lieber, LL. D., Corresponding Member of the Institute of France, etc., Author of "Political Ethics," "Principles of Legal and Political Interpretation," etc., etc. Enlarged Edition in one volume. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott. London: Trübner & Co., 1859.

It is remarkable that the two most profound and instructive works on the philosophy of American institutions should have been written, the one by a Frenchman—the late Mr. de Tocqueville, the other by a German—Prof. Lieber, formerly Professor of History and Political Science in the State College of South Carolina, and since 1857 in Columbia College, New York. And yet the fact is easily explained. A thoroughly educated and liberal minded foreigner, coming to us with a full knowledge of European monarchies, and residing among us sufficiently long to study the theory and working of the American republic, under all its forms and aspects, has better opportunities and advantages for a comparative discussion of the various systems of government than any native American. Besides it is characteristic of the German mind, and also of the more reflective and serious class of Frenchmen, such as de Tocqueville and Guizot, to trace historical institutions to their origin, to exhibit their gradual growth, to show their relative necessity, their general bearings upon, and connections with, the national life and the state of the world at large; while the English and American mind is mainly concerned with the knowledge of present facts and duties. The more speculative German wants to know *how* and *why* a thing became as it is; the more practical American is satisfied to know *that* it is and *what* it is. The one looks at the *Werden* or the genesis, the other at the *Gewordensein* or the result.

The American system of government belongs to the Teutonic and more particularly the Anglican order as distinct from the Romanic. It shares with the government of old England

the common law, trial by jury, popular representation and legislation, self-taxation, publicity of proceeding, subjection of the army and navy to the legislature, liberty of speech and the press, division of power, and all those forms, guarantees and checks which constitute and uphold the only rational and possible form of national liberty—that which is based upon the moral power of self-government and the absolute supremacy of law. But, in addition to this, the American system implies some important original features, as republican federalism, greater equality, and the strict separation of the secular and spiritual power; while England is a constitutional monarchy, essentially aristocratic in its social structure, and still holds to the principle of state-churchism, or an established religion. The North American republic, the only one deserving the name in the Western hemisphere, is the greatest experiment of self-government which has yet been made in history, and the whole civilized world is interested in its ultimate success or failure. Such a government is eminently worthy of profound historical and philosophical study in comparison with other and opposite forms of government, especially the French centralization system, which is essentially despotic and which now, under its most consistent, imposing and brilliant form, that of Napoleonic imperialism, is again controlling the destinies and threatening the liberty and independence of continental Europe.

We know of no better guide in such study than this book of Prof. Lieber. It is based upon mature knowledge, long observation, and a just sense of the frailty and dignity of man as being too feeble to wield unlimited power, and yet too noble to submit to it. There runs through it a certain vein of vanity in the frequent recurrence of the little word I, which should be excluded from scientific works, and the references to the other works of the author. But while we regret this little weakness in a gentleman of such superior literary talent and attainments, it cannot blind us to the high merits of the work. It is eminently calculated to strengthen the attachment to the English and American form of government in preference to the French, or any other which now obtains in the civilized world. We read the first edition which appeared in 1853, with more than usual interest, and have glanced at the second, which is somewhat enlarged with such remarks, mostly in the form of notes, which the political experience of the last few years has

suggested. But the only addition of importance seems to be the insertion of the French Constitution of 1793, as contrasted with the American, in the Appendix N. XI. p. 536, sqq.

P. S.

An American Dictionary of the English Language, etc., etc. By Noah Webster, etc. Revised and enlarged by Chauncy A. Goodrich, etc. To which are now added Pictorial Illustrations, etc. Springfield, Mass.: G. & M. Merriam. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippencott & Co., 1859.

This new edition of Webster's unabridged Dictionary, which will hereafter go by the name of the Pictorial edition, contains not only all the matter of the previous revised editions, but several new features which give it a decided preference before all others. In the first place we have here an addition of not less than fifteen hundred pictorial illustrations of terms in architecture, geometry, heraldry, coats of arms, mechanics, botany, ornithology, natural history, geology, mythology, antiquities, etc. These illustrations of things which admit of a better definition by an engraving than in words, were first introduced into Dr. Ogilvie's Imperial Dictionary (which is substantially an English reprint of Webster) in 1847, and are here executed with a high degree of artistic skill and taste. They are not scattered through the vocabulary, as in the English work, but placed by themselves and classified under leading or generic terms with a subordinate alphabetical arrangement and references to the pages of the vocabulary where the words occur. The value and use of such pictorial illustrations, especially for children and young scholars is obvious. Some of the pictures, however, might have been left out, as the organ-grinder, the lady in hoops, and the old witch riding through the air with a broom-stick. The new edition contains also a valuable table of several hundred synonyms, alphabetically arranged and defined with accurate discrimination by Prof. Chauncey A. Goodrich of Yale College, (p. CLXV—CCXXXIV); an appendix to the vocabulary, embracing nearly ten thousand new words and definitions (p. 1283—1363); tables of Scripture names, Greek and Latin proper names and modern geographical names, exhibiting the pronunciation of each, prepared under the direction of Prof. N. Porter (p. 1365–1458); a pronouncing vocabu-

lary of proper names of distinguished individuals of modern times (p. 1459–1493); and finally a list of familiar quotations, words, phrases and colloquial expressions from the Latin, French, Italian and Spanish, rendered into English by William G. Webster (p. 1495–1504).

With these additions, by different hands, Webster's Dictionary has become a real lexicographical Encyclopedia, perhaps more so than any other work of the kind. This completeness of vocabulary and auxiliary information, together with the acknowledged merit of its definitions which convey the necessary information in the simplest and clearest common sense terms, will always secure Webster's Dictionary a prëeminent place among its predecessors and rivals, and make it indispensable for a long time to come.

Nevertheless it is still open to serious objections and admits of material improvements, which the enterprizing publishers would do well to incorporate in some future edition. Without claiming any superior knowledge of English lexicography, we may as well explain ourselves on this occasion more fully.

Our first objection is to the etymologies of Webster's Dictionary, especially the German part, which is the most important, since about two thirds of the English vocabulary is Saxon or Teutonic. These are not only defective, but in many instances incorrect, and should be subjected to a thorough revision by a master of the entire field of Teutonic and comparative philology, including, of course, the Sanscrit, the mother of the Indo-Germanic family of languages. We saw it stated recently that the editors have employed a learned German professor for this very purpose, but we heard nothing as yet of the result of his labors.

The second defect is the external and mechanical collocation of the different meanings of words without reference either to their historical development or their logical connection. In this, as well as in the etymological part, we greatly prefer the plan of Richardson's English, Gesenius' Hebrew, and Pape's Greek and Grimm's German Dictionary. The primitive meaning should always be given first, and then the other meanings should follow in the order of time and logical sequence, accompanied in each case with appropriate quotations from the classics of the different ages. Thus the definitions would present

a history of the respective words and the progress of the English language and literature down to American usage.

The third and most general, although in our estimation less serious objection to Webster, is his orthography, which has provoked great hostility to it, especially in England. We are not opposed to his innovations altogether, especially those which would have gradually obtained and were making their way without, and even before, his agency, such as the dropping of the k and u in a number of words. But we object to his want of system and wish the changes so modified and reduced as to retain, as much as possible, the traces of the origin of words.—The regard to simplicity and sound, which he seems to have consulted exclusively, should be regulated and controlled by the *etymological* principle. Hence we do not plead at all for the restoration of k in *public, music, physic,* etc., for the simple reason that it is useless in itself and obscures the Latin origin of these words from *publicus,* etc. Just as little do we advocate the u in *favor* and *honor,* because the omission brings these words nearer the pronunciation and the original Latin *favor* and *honor,* from which the French *faveur* and *honeur* are derived. But for the same etymological reason we greatly prefer *antique* (Latin *antiquus,* French *antique*) to *antic* or *antick,* and *centre* (Greek κεντον, Latin *centrum,* French *centre*) to *center.* The same applies to *metre, mitre, theatre, sceptre, sabre, calibre, lustre,* where Webster substitutes likewise *er* for *re,* without giving any object but that of observing the etymology and introducing confusion. The dropping of the o in *oeconomical* and *oecumenical,* of a in *aesthetical* is likewise a violation of the etymological canon. Webster's omission of the double consonant in *travelling, levelling, counselling, duelling* and similar verbs, might perhaps be defended on the ground of the accent being on the antepenultima. But it is apt to introduce confusion, since Webster himself retains the double consonant in all those participles where the accent is on the penultima, as in *referring* from refer, *controlling,* from control. And then he is justly chargeable with inconsistency in *doubling* the consonant in many other cases against the general usage, as in *fullfill* for fulfil, *controll* for control, *enroll* for enrol, *distill* for distil, *skillfull* for skilful, *willfull* for wilful, although in several of these instances he has the etymology (*vollfüllen, willvoll,* etc.,) on his side. Upon the whole

it would have been far better if he had adhered to the usual mode of spelling, except in about half a dozen instances, which commend themselves at once to common sense as improvements.

P. S.

Historical Sketches of Hymns, their Writers, and their Influence. By Joseph Belcher, D. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1859. Pages 415. (Price $1,25.)

We welcome this work as a timely contribution to English hymnology. It contains a large amount of interesting and useful information, industriously collected from a variety of sources, and is gotten up in that chaste and elegant style which distinguishes the publications of Messrs. Lindsay & Blakiston.

We must, however, restrict the praise and recommendation of the book before us. The title would lead the reader to expect a work on general hymnology, while in fact it is confined simply to English hymnology. Of the sacred poetry of the ancient Greek and Latin Church we find only a few scattered and unsatisfactory notices in the Introduction; the German hymnology, the richest of all, seems to be a *terra incognita* to the author beyond a few fine sayings of Luther on the importance and use of poetry and music in public worship. The book, moreover, is not strictly scientific and critical, but a popular compilation for popular use. We would greatly prefer if Dr. Belcher—a Baptist minister from England who spent many years in this country, wrote a life of Whitefield and several devotional books and died at Philadelphia shortly after the completion of his hymnological work in manuscript—had indicated the authorities from which he derived his information. As it is, we have no dates to determine the accuracy of his statements. Finally, the plan and arrangement of the work, which is alphabetical, and not chronological, may be convenient for reference, but throws no light on the history and progress of hymnology. In all these respects it is not to be compared with Dr. Koch's *Geschichte des Kirchenlied's und Kirchengesangs* (in four vols.) and other German works on the same general subject.

Yet with all these defects the work is evidently a labor of love and the more to be valued as it seems to be the only book

of its kind on the *English* branch of Christian hymnology, on which Dr. Koch and other German hymnologists, give us no information whatever. And yet the English and Anglo-American hymnology, next to the German, is decidedly the richest in Christendom and is still growing. A few more books like that of Dr. Belcher, and the way will be sufficiently prepared for a critical and scholarly history of English hymnology. We are glad to see that our author is opposed to the propensity for arbitrary changes which seems to be spreading among recent compilers of American hymn books. In some cases changes are real improvements, or have been generally received, as John Wesley's

> "Before Jehovah's awful throne
> Ye nations bow with sacred joy,"

for Isaac Watt's original version of the hundredth Psalm:

> "Nations attend before his throne,
> With solemn fear, with sacred joy."

But "of every hundred of the changes," says Dr. Belcher, "at least ninety and nine are for the worse." (p. 63.) It is absolutely necessary, therefore, in making a choice selection of hymns, to go back to the original source and first inspiration of the poet. If the hymn is found to be objectionable on the ground of doctrine or religious sentiment, it should not be rejected at once; but if it breathe the genuine spirit of sacred poetry and of sound evangelical piety, it ought not to be changed, except for strong reasons of language or taste, and even in that case, always with great care, with a nice sense of responsibility and, if possible, in the very spirit and style of the author and his age.

P. S.

COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL OF JOHN. By Dr. Augustus Tholuck. Translated from the German by Charles P. Krauth, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., No. 40, North Sixth street. 1859.

Another valuable contribution to Anglo-German theology and literature. Of Dr. Tholuck as a man, a Christian, a scholar and divine, we have spoken at length in our book on Germany and elsewhere. His name always awakens pleasant memories in our mind, since we spent six months in his house, and in his

almost daily intercourse. He is unquestionably one of the most interesting literary men of the age, especially to an American student travelling in Europe, and will always occupy a pre-eminent position in the history of the great revival of evangelical theology and piety in Germany. His Commentary on the Gospel of St. John is not near as *gründlich* and *erschöpfend* as his Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount, or the last *Umarbeitung* of the Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. In its first editions it was even regarded as superficial and unsatisfactory in the exposition of the most difficult and important passages. But in its later editions it has undergone such material improvements that it now ranks among the best modern Commentaries on that Gospel which represents the holy of holies of the evangelical history, and is taken as it were from the very heart of Christ. Lücke is more thorough and elaborate; Olshausen has a peculiar flavor and unction; De Wette is more condensed, but less sound; Meyer more accurate in point of grammar and verbal criticism, though less satisfactory in theological expression; but Tholuck combines a variety of excellencies that adapt it especially to the wants of students, for whose benefit it was originally prepared. As to the translation, which is made from the sixth edition (1843) with additions from the seventh (1857), we take it for granted, without special examination, that our friend Dr. Krauth, from his talents and general attainments, his knowledge of, and taste for, the German language and literature, and his connection with the largest German denomination of this country, was as well qualified for this task as any American divine and has done full justice to the original.

P. S.

The History of the Religious Movement of the Eighteenth Century called Methodism, considered in its different denominational forms, and its relations to British and American Protestantism. By Abel Stevens, LL. D. Vol. II. From the death of Whitefield to the death of Wesley. New York: Publ. by Carlton & Porter, 200 Mulberry Street. 1859.

This is the second volume of an extensive, elaborate, well written and elegantly printed work, which promises to give a

more complete history of Methodism in the old and new world, from the Methodist and general Protestant point of view, than has yet been published either in England or in this country. It is intended to be a standard work "for reference, in respect to all important dates, proceedings of Methodist ecclesiastical bodies, decisions of theological questions, numerical returns, and other similar details." The two volumes so far published, bring the religious movement of Methodism, which exerted such a powerful influence over the Anglo-Saxon race in all parts of the globe, to the death of its founder. Another volume, we presume, will be necessary to complete its history in the old world, and at least two more for the history of American Methodism. If the remaining volumes follow the second in as rapid a succession as the second volume succeeded the first, we may see it completed in a few years. We have not been able to give this work such attention as it deserves, but hope at some future time to make it the basis of an independent article on the genius and mission of Methodism.

P. S.

A Treatise on Theism and the Modern Skeptical Theories. By Francis Wharton, Professor in Kenyon College, Ohio. J. B. Lippincott, Phila. 1859.

This work consists of two parts. The first treats somewhat in detail of the evidences of the existence and character of God as they are given by conscience, the mind in general, nature, society, &c. The second, and larger part of the treatise, is employed in giving a condensed statement and refutation of various theories, which have obscured our knowledge of the Divine Being, or entirely ignored his proper and independent existence, such as the systems of an Imperfect Creator, Optimism, Positivism, Fatalism, Pantheism and Development. The latter we regard as the most valuable and important part of the book, inasmuch as it gives a bird's eye view of the various sceptical tendencies of the human mind in a popular form, so as to be accessible to the general reader. A large space is devoted to Positivism, the most recent and dangerous form of French infidelity, dangerous, because it professes to base itself upon the sciences, and proceeds, as must be admitted on all hands, from an author, who has an eminently scientific mind.

The refutation is popular in its character, ingenious, and, for the space allotted to it, complete. Positivism is the infidelity of the proud Scientist, who, accustomed to rigorous mathematical demonstrations and tangible experiments in his investigations, looks with disdain upon the provinces of Theology and Philosophy, and politely bows them out of the domain of established knowledge. Pantheism, on the other hand, is the error into which the profoundest and most earnest thinkers have fallen when no longer guided by the star of Divine Revelation. It has made its appearance wherever the human mind had attained to the highest degree of cultivation. It may indeed be regarded as the goal of all deep and earnest thinking in the sphere of nature, the necessary conclusion, to which all vigorous speculation that sets aside the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation, must sooner or later arrive. It is an intuition, we may say, of humanity itself, that, if the Deity exist as a living, active spirit, he should manifest and embody himself somewhere and in some way. Revelation teaches us that this embodiment is to be found in Christ, the Son of God, for in Him dwelleth the fulness of the God-head bodily, whilst the heathen or deist, if he be consequent, must make the world as a whole, or its particular departments, this embodiment, because he can find it no where else. Under this view, pantheism cannot be successfully refuted by one who occcupies a common stand-point with the pantheist on the outside of Christianity. The chapter on Pantheism in Prof. Wharton's book, is, therefore, to us the least satisfactory. Moreover, it is treated in too summary a manner, and, although the objections to the system seem to be well taken, the author does not seem to feel the strength or charm which Pantheism must ever have for speculative minds, nor the deep root which it has in our common human nature.

The book is readable and interesting. It evinces an inquiring and cultivated mind, supplied with extensive reading in reference to the subject of which it treats. The illustrations are numerous, too much so perhaps, but generally happy in their character. Many of them are taken from our American soil, which gives a freshness to the discussions, which we do not meet with in other works of a similar character. As a popular work on an important subject we recommend it for general circulation. T. A.

THE CHRISTIAN HOME, AS IT IS IN THE SPHERE OF NATURE AND THE CHURCH. By Rev. Samuel Philips, A. M., Pastor of the first German Reformed church, Chambersburg, Pa. Published by G. & F. Bill, Springfield, Mass. 1859.

We are happy to meet with the above book. It comes to us as a friend amid the most interesting, trying and solemn relations of life. It speaks of Home, a subject in regard to which we can never tire. We love to think of Home and dwell upon the various relations which it involves; and it is certainly true that the more deeply we pentrate these relations in the way of earnest thought and reflection, the more correctly will we understand the true philosophy of life; and the more freely we live in them, the more nearly will we approximate in fact the high Scriptural ideal of human existence.

In all the pages of this book the accomplished author has illustrated the fact that he wields the pen of a ready writer. The reader will discover in every part the presence of great care, but this care always combined with the most perfect freedom. You never behold signs of *labor* on the part of the author when seeking to express an idea or shade of idea, but all seems to flow forth, as by an inward spontaniety, from the author's own consciousness. It springs up like a fountain, and only labors when it is sought, by outward circumstances, to keep it down. The power *over* words and the power *of* words are both finely illustrated in the peculiar style, limpid and musical, which runs through the whole book. The thought is always nicely conceived, logically embodied and beautifully expressed; and not unfrequently is the reader delighted with strokes of real eloquence and genuine pathos. It abounds also with apt and many rare quotations of poetry, especially where the desire seems to be to throw sunbeams of light and joy into minds filled with darkness and sorrow in consequence of providential affliction. The author speaks to the afflicted not only as one who has himself experienced the deep throes of grief at parting from loved ones, but also as one who has clearly apprehended the true source of comfort and hope, with peculiar power to exhibit it to others. In this view the book here offered to the public will be highly prized by many.

The book is varied as to contents. In itself it may be called a *library* on the subject of Home. It dwells, to a greater or less extent, upon almost every conceivable feature connected

with the Family Relation; and yet it is not by any means superficial or trite at any point. The whole subject, under its general aspect, being clearly conceived and stated in the beginning, it required afterwards often but a few words to exhibit the details in their most profound relations: and yet all this is done with a most engaging and popular manner. In this will consist the charm of this work for all classes of mind and for all degrees of education—from the lowest upward.

But the chief merits of the book, after all, lie in its true conceptions of Home, as the natural, and in a certain sense also, as the Spiritual source of our being. Home is neither an actual play-house, nor an unsubstantial picture, but a real fountain of real being, opened by the divine hand itself. It is not only the real channel through which we derive our personal existence, but it is also the continuous and divinely ordained power by which this personal existence is affected and moulded, and thus conditioned to reach either its true glory or its lasting shame. It is truly organic, not only as to its conception or being as a whole, but also as to the operation of all its specific forces, physical, mental and moral through all the parts of which it is composed. As it is divine already in the form of nature, it looks to Christianity by a necessary inherent gaze, as the only sphere in which it can properly actualize its true form and complete its true life. Here it becomes a real and vital part of the Christian Church, in which natural relations, involving natural affections and duties, become the basis of spiritual relations, involving spiritual affections and duties. This is not a *double home*, but a single house in its true two-fold relation, first to the world of nature, and second to the world of spirit—first to time, and second to eternity. It is the latter that gives substance, stability and dignity to the former.

From this stand-point the author is at once enabled to take a true view of parents, their duties, cares and responsibilities in their relation to each other and the children in whom they became united as one flesh, as also the relation of children to their parents and each other, and the duties growing out of these relations.

In this view of the case, which is indeed the only true Scriptural view, it is quite easy to perceive that it is a very different thing to be born in a Christian family from being born in one which is not Christian. The basis of Holy Baptism in the first

is laid already in the natural constitution of the child; and it is upon this substantial natural ground (a ground nevertheless laid by the wisdom and power and grace of God) that the promise is founded, "I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee in their generations." Here the holy ordinance of Baptism assumes its true and high character; and the manner in which the author brings out this part of his general subject is truly refreshing when contrasted with the low and meaningless views which prevail so extensively in regard to this sacred and divine institution.

But we should have to extend this notice far beyond our present design to express the full bearings of this timely work on the Christian Home. We therefore close by cordially recommending it to every family. It is just the book which every parent should read and study, and then place it in the hands of his sons and daughters. In this event, we have no doubt but that Home, in many cases, would assume a very different complexion from what it now wears. The home feeling would soon show itself as the first fruit with promise; sacred home memories would be sacredly cherished; the names of father and mother—always significant and tender—would carry with them the sound of a still deeper, richer melody; and every link in the golden chain that binds happy hearts would exhibit to the sight of each the divine mould in which it was formed and the exceeding preciousness of the material of which it is composed. The book is happily adapted to every emergency of life whether on the part of parents or children, separated or united. Its suggestions and reasonings will be found especially useful to children in the great turning point of life, in the choice of a companion, in the selection on an occupation, or in regard to any interest that may have power to affect the true well-being of children, both for time and eternity.

Thanking the worthy author for the pleasure and profit which we ourselves have derived from a perusal of this volume, we would heartily recommend it to all others whose eyes may fall upon this brief and very imperfect notice.

D. G.

ERRATUM.

In January number for this year, page 84, 14th line from bottom of page, for *chosen twelve*, read *evangelists*.

3 1198 04015 0935
N/1198/04015/0935X

UNIVERSITY of PENNSYLVANIA LIBRARIES

Periodical

3 1198 04015 0935
N/1198/04015/0935X